

Van Hove Exciton-Cageons and High- T_c Superconductivity: XA: Role of Spin-Orbit Coupling in Generating a Diabolical Point

R.S. Markiewicz

Physics Department and Barnett Institute, Northeastern U., Boston MA 02115

Abstract

Spin-orbit coupling plays a large role in stabilizing the low-temperature orthorhombic phase of $\text{La}_{2-x}\text{Sr}_x\text{CuO}_4$. It splits the degeneracy of the van Hove singularities (thereby stabilizing the distorted phase) and completely changes the shape of the Fermi surfaces, potentially introducing diabolical points into the band structure. The present paper gives a detailed account of the resulting electronic structure.

A slave boson calculation shows how these results are modified in the presence of strong correlation effects. A scaling regime, found very close to the metal-insulator transition, allows an analytical determination of the crossover, in the limit of zero oxygen-oxygen hopping, $t_{OO} \rightarrow 0$. Extreme care must be exercised in choosing the parameters of the three-band model. In particular, t_{OO} is renormalized from its LDA value. Furthermore, it is suggested that the slave boson model be spin-corrected, in which case the system is close to a metal-insulator transition at half filling.

PACS numbers : 71.27.+a, 74.20.Mn

I. INTRODUCTION

The suggestion that the van Hove singularity (vHs) plays an important role in high- T_c superconductivity [1] has been greatly strengthened by recent photoemission studies, which find that the Fermi level is very close to the vHs at the compositions of optimum T_c , both in $\text{Bi}_2\text{Sr}_2\text{CaCu}_2\text{O}_8$ (Bi-2212) [2] and in $\text{YBa}_2\text{Cu}_3\text{O}_7$ (YBCO) [3]. Furthermore, it has been shown theoretically that the vHs's in $\text{La}_{2-x}\text{Sr}_x\text{CuO}_4$ (LSCO) and related compounds drive a very strong electron-phonon interaction [4–6]. The mechanism is via a vHs-Jahn-Teller effect, wherein the two vHs's provide the electronic degeneracy which can be split by a lattice distortion – a band Jahn-Teller (JT) effect. However, in order to reproduce the experimental phase diagram, it was found [4] that electronic correlations play an essential role, by renormalizing the band structure. The present paper is a first attempt to treat both the electron-hole coupling and correlation effects on an equal footing.

It is found that spin-orbit coupling plays a dominant role in driving the structural instability, and leads to major reconstruction of the Fermi surfaces. It acts like a form of umklapp scattering, splitting the degeneracy of the vHs's (even in the LTO phase!), and producing gaps in the vicinity of the old vHs's, thereby transforming the large Fermi surfaces into small pockets in better agreement with Hall effect measurements. However, while this coupling can restructure the Fermi surfaces, *it cannot eliminate vHs's*. Instead, the vHs's are split and shifted in energy, forming a very complex pattern of up to four vHs's, with corresponding peaks in the density of states (dos). A detailed description of the various possibilities is presented.

A most interesting possibility is that, if spin-orbit coupling is strong enough, the band may possess a *diabolical point*, at which the Fermi surface shrinks to a point, and the dos vanishes. The possible role of such a state in the antiferromagnetic insulating phase at half filling is discussed.

The importance of these features depends critically on relative values of several band parameters – both bare parameter values and how the values renormalize in the presence of

correlation effects. It is found that there remains considerable uncertainty in the optimal values for several parameters, but approximate estimates are given.

Finally, correlation effects are included by means of a slave boson calculation. In the absence of spin-orbit (and other electron-phonon) coupling, a full calculation is given (to lowest order in $1/N$) for the three-band model of the CuO_2 planes, and the metal-insulator phase boundary is found. In the limit of strong renormalization of the Cu-O hopping parameter, a scaling regime is found in which the self-consistent equations greatly simplify. The phase boundary is found to lie in the range of the optimum parameters.

When spin-orbit and electron-phonon coupling are included, it is found that there is still a scaling regime, and that, since the additional coupling is small, the phase boundary is nearly unchanged. For the parameters chosen, the state at half filling is semimetallic; however, a larger, renormalized value of the spin-orbit coupling parameter might be more appropriate. In this case, the state at half filling would become a zero-gap semiconductor with diabolical point.

This paper naturally divides into two parts. First, Sections II, III show how spin-orbit (and electron-phonon) coupling modifies the three-band, tight-binding model of the CuO_2 planes, splitting the degeneracy of the vHs's *even in the LTO phase*. The new Fermi surfaces and vHs's are described in detail, and it is shown that at half filling there can be either compensated, semimetallic Fermi surfaces, or a zero-gap semiconductor with a *diabolical point* at precisely half filling (Section III). The remainder of the paper introduces correlations into the problem, via slave boson calculations. This includes a discussion of the proper choice of parameters (Section IV), the self-consistent equations and their modification in the presence of spin-orbit coupling (Section VA), the analysis of a *scaling regime* (and its modification in the presence of spin-orbit coupling) which exists near the metal-insulator transition (Section VB,C), and a more general discussion of parameter renormalization near this transition (Section VD). Conclusions are discussed in Section VI, while Section VII discusses a number of new features which arise in the presence of spin-orbit coupling and the possible diabolical point.

II. ROLE OF SPIN-ORBIT COUPLING IN THE STRUCTURAL TRANSITIONS

Spin-orbit coupling plays two major roles in the structural transitions. First, since spin-orbit coupling is linear in the tilt angle θ , while ordinary electron-phonon coupling is quadratic, the spin-orbit term dominates in driving the structural transition [7,8]. Secondly, spin-orbit coupling can split the degeneracy of the vHs's, leading to a large electronic contribution to the stabilization of the LTO phase [6].

A. Spin-Orbit Coupling

In $\text{La}_{2-x}\text{Ba}_x\text{CuO}_4$ (LBCO), there is a series of structural transitions as the temperature is lowered, from a high-temperature tetragonal (HTT) phase near room temperature, to the low-temperature orthorhombic (LTO) phase, and, in a restricted doping range, to the low-temperature tetragonal phase (LTT), which has a deleterious effect on superconductivity. It has long been recognized that the distortion in the LTT phase splits the degeneracy of the two vHs's [9], thereby acting like a classical charge density wave, or static JT effect.

On the other hand, it was generally assumed [10] that since the two vHs's remain degenerate by symmetry in the LTO phase, the LTO transition is unrelated to the vHs's. This argument is incorrect, and in fact there are two distinct ways in which splitting of the vHs's can drive the LTO transition [6]. From general symmetry arguments, it can be shown that spin-orbit coupling can lift the orbital degeneracy on most of the orthorhombic Brillouin zone, leading to a splitting of the vHs density of states peak. Alternatively, the LTO phase could be a *dynamic* JT phase, in which the local symmetry differs from the global one, stabilized by a dynamic splitting of the vHs degeneracy. Based on this picture, I presented [4] a simplified calculation of the resulting doping dependence of the LTO phase transition and the competing superconductivity.

A complication in analyzing this transition is that the soft mode of the transition involves a tilting of the CuO_6 octahedra, which has conventionally been found to couple only

quadratically to the electrons (non-Migdal behavior) [11,5,12]. Recently, however, it has been pointed out that spin-orbit coupling also introduces a linear coupling between the electrons and the tilt mode [8]. In the present paper, I explore the role of spin-orbit coupling in driving the LTO transition. This Subection describes the modifications of the band structure due to spin-orbit coupling in the LTO and LTT phases. Unlike earlier work [8], no magnetic ordering is assumed.

The analysis is based on the standard three-band model of the CuO_2 plane, involving both Cu-O (t_{CuO}) and O-O (t_{OO}) hopping:

$$H = \sum_j (\Delta d_j^\dagger d_j + \sum_{\hat{\delta}} t_{CuO} [d_j^\dagger p_{j+\hat{\delta}} + (c.c.)] + \sum_{\hat{\delta}'} t_{OO} [p_{j+\hat{\delta}}^\dagger p_{j+\hat{\delta}'} + (c.c.)] + U n_{j\uparrow} n_{j\downarrow}), \quad (1)$$

where $d^\dagger$ ($p^\dagger$) is a creation operator for holes on Cu (O), j is summed over lattice sites, $\hat{\delta}$ over nearest neighbors, $\hat{\delta}'$ over next-nearest (O-O) neighbors, and c.c. stands for complex conjugate. Energies are measured from the center of the O bands, with Δ the bare Cu-O splitting, and U is the on-site Coulomb repulsion. In a slave boson calculation, U produces correlations which renormalize the one-electron band parameters. Hence, in the present section the Coulomb term will be neglected, in order to study how the band structure is modified as extra terms are added to Eq. 1. In Section IV, the slave boson technique will be used to determine the renormalized band structure.

Coffey, et al. [7] showed that, in the presence of octahedral tilt, spin-orbit coupling introduces an additional, spin-dependent hopping term into the Hamiltonian, Eq. 1, of the form

$$H' = \sum_{j,\hat{\delta}} \sum_{\alpha,\beta} (d_{j,\alpha}^\dagger i \vec{\lambda}_{j,j+\hat{\delta}} \cdot \vec{\sigma}_{\alpha,\beta} p_{j+\hat{\delta},\beta} + (c.c.)), \quad (2)$$

where α and β are spin indices, $\vec{\sigma}_{\alpha,\beta}$ is the vector of spin matrices, and the coupling parameter has the form

$$\vec{\lambda}_{j,j+\hat{x}} = (-1)^{j_x+j_y} (\lambda_1, \lambda'_2, 0), \quad (3a)$$

$$\vec{\lambda}_{j,j+\hat{y}} = -(-1)^{j_x+j_y} (\lambda_2, \lambda'_1, 0), \quad (3b)$$

where the λ_i 's are microscopic parameters, estimated to be $\lambda_i = \gamma_i \theta$, with θ the octahedral tilt angle and $\gamma_2 > \gamma_1 > 0$, $\lambda'_i = \lambda_i$ in the LTO phase, and $= 0$ in the LTT phase, and the values of λ_i are larger by a factor $\sqrt{2}$ in the LTT phase, for a given tilt angle.

B. Modified Band Structure in the Presence of Spin-Orbit Scattering

The LTO phase of LSCO has symmetry group Bmab; in the absence of spin-orbit coupling, this means that the electronic states on the X^* face of the Brillouin zone have an additional two-fold degeneracy (beyond the usual spin degeneracy), which means that the degeneracy of the two vHs's cannot be split by a transition to a uniform orthorhombic phase.

Spin-orbit scattering dramatically alters this situation. The spin ceases to be a good quantum number, and the eigenfunctions mix up and down spin states. There is still a two-fold Kramers degeneracy, but the extra degeneracy on the X^* face is lifted everywhere, except at X^* itself [6]. This section will provide a detailed calculation of how the Fermi surfaces are changed by the spin-orbit coupling, Eq. 2.

The orthorhombic unit cell is double the area of the HTT cell, containing 2 Cu's and 4 O's per layer. Since up and down spins must be treated separately, the resulting Hamiltonian matrix is a 12×12 . By properly symmetrizing the two Cu's (and corresponding O's) this can be reduced to two 6×6 matrices, which are Kramers' doublets. The eigenvalues are then given by

$$\det \begin{pmatrix} \Delta_- - E & 2tc_x & 2tc_y & 0 & -2\lambda_x^* s_x & -2\lambda_y^* s_y \\ 2tc_x & -E & v & 2\lambda_x^* c_x & 0 & 0 \\ 2tc_y & v & -E & 2\lambda_y^* c_y & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 2\lambda_x c_x & 2\lambda_y c_y & \Delta_+ - E & 2ts_x & 2ts_y \\ -2\lambda_x s_x & 0 & 0 & 2ts_x & -E & u \\ -2\lambda_y s_y & 0 & 0 & 2ts_y & u & -E \end{pmatrix} = 0, \quad (4)$$

with $t = t_{CuO}$, $s_i = \sin(k_i a/2)$, $c_i = \cos(k_i a/2)$, $i = x, y$, $u = 4t_{OO} s_x s_y$, $v = 4t_{OO} c_x c_y$, $\Delta_{\pm} = \Delta$, and, for LTO, $\lambda_x = (\lambda_1 + i\lambda_2)$, $\lambda_y = -(\lambda_2 + i\lambda_1)$ (for LTT, $\lambda_x = \sqrt{2}\lambda_1$, $\lambda_y = -\sqrt{2}\lambda_2$).

For the general case, Eq. 4 must be solved numerically, but in the special case $t_{OO} = 0$, the determinant can be reduced to a quadratic equation

$$[E(\Delta - E) + 4t^2 + 2\bar{\lambda}^2]^2 = 4[t^2(\bar{c}_x + \bar{c}_y) + 2|\lambda_x|^2\bar{c}_x + 2|\lambda_y|^2\bar{c}_y]^2 - 16t^2\bar{c}_x\bar{c}_y\lambda^2, \quad (5)$$

with $\bar{\lambda}^2 = \lambda_1^2 + \lambda_2^2$, $\lambda = \lambda_1 + \lambda_2$, and $\bar{c}_i = \cos(k_i a)$, $i = x, y$. When $\bar{c}_x = \bar{c}_y = 0$, the right-hand side of Eq. 5 vanishes, leading to the (symmetry-required) two-fold degeneracy at X^* and Y^* ($\bar{M}$, in the pseudo-tetragonal cell we are using). The generalization of Eq. 5 to arbitrary t_{OO} is given in Appendix I.

C. Electron-Phonon Interaction

As discussed elsewhere [5], ordinary electron-phonon coupling can split the vHs degeneracy in the LTT phase, but not in a uniform LTO phase. Moreover, the coupling is quadratic in the tilt angle, θ , and hence of non-Migdal form [11,5,12]. However, after the spin-orbit coupling leads to a finite tilt, this ordinary electron-phonon coupling can enhance the tilt instability. Hence, in this subsection, the above expressions are modified to include a JT-like phonon coupling. In Ref. [5], I showed that an important contribution comes from coupling between the Cu $d_{x^2-y^2}$ orbital and the O p_z orbital. This contribution can be incorporated into the interaction matrix, Eq. 4, by the substitution (in the LTO phase)

$$\Delta_{\pm} = \Delta + \eta[2 \pm (\bar{c}_x + \bar{c}_y)], \quad (6a)$$

where

$$\eta = \frac{2t'^2}{E}, \quad (6b)$$

and t' ($\propto \sin\theta$) is the Cu-Op_z hopping matrix element. Note that strictly speaking, η is inversely proportional to the energy, and hence will modify the eigenvalues of Eq. 4 at each angle. However, it should be sufficiently accurate for present purposes to treat η as a fixed

parameter, of approximate magnitude $\eta \sim 2t'^2/\Delta$. In this approximation, Equation 6 is very similar to the electron-phonon coupling recently proposed by Song and Annett [12].

From the form of Eq. 6, the electron-phonon coupling does not split the vHs degeneracy in the LTO phase – in fact, Eq. 6 reduces to a constant along the Brillouin zone diagonal, $\bar{c}_x + \bar{c}_y = 0$. In the LTT phase, the expression should be modified, as

$$2 - (\bar{c}_x + \bar{c}_y) \rightarrow 2(\sin^2\theta_x s_x^2 + \sin^2\theta_y s_y^2),$$

where θ_i is the tilt in the LTT phase (e.g., in one domain, θ_y would vanish).

D. Numerical Results

Equation 4 has been solved numerically, and the resulting energy bands and Fermi surfaces are illustrated in Figures 1-6. Figure 1 shows the resulting energy dispersions for a series of different band parameters. The appropriate choice of parameters for calculating the effects of correlations will be discussed in detail in Section IV. Here, for illustrative purposes, values close to the bare band parameters will be assumed. These can be taken as $t = 1.3eV$, $\Delta = 4eV$, $t_{OO} = 0.65eV$, $\lambda_2 \leq \lambda_1 \simeq 6meV$, and $\eta \simeq 5 - 10meV$. The special points of the Brillouin zone are based on the tetragonal supercell, which has twice the area of the orthorhombic zone: $\Gamma = (0, 0)$, $X = (\pi/a, 0)$, $Y = (0, \pi/a)$, $M = (\pi/a, \pi/a)$, and $\bar{M} = M/2$.

The original, untilted case, with $\lambda_i = \eta = 0$, is illustrated in Figure 1a. It can easily be understood as the usual dispersion found in the tetragonal cell (solid line) modified by the zone folding associated with the real space cell size doubling, which maps $M \rightarrow \Gamma$. The corresponding Fermi surfaces are shown in Fig. 2a. The energy levels freely intersect without interacting along the orthorhombic zone boundary. In particular, they need not be perpendicular to this boundary when they intersect it. Under these circumstances, it is convenient to work in a double cell (the original tetragonal zone) and ignore the zone folded bands. This is what is usually done.

However, spin-orbit coupling breaks this degeneracy almost everywhere along the zone boundary. This coupling acts like an umklapp term, mixing the original and zone folded

bands. The resulting, reconstructed Fermi surfaces bear little resemblance to the original surfaces in the regions of overlap. Figure 2b illustrates how the Fermi surfaces of Fig. 2a are modified by the presence of a small spin-orbit term ($\lambda_2 = 6meV$, $\lambda_1 = \eta = 0$). The two lower energy levels ($E_F = 4.5, 5eV$) did not overlap, and are essentially unchanged. The third level, $5.28eV$, was initially at the vHs, with area proportional to $1 + x$ (with x the Sr doping), but the overlap has distorted the Fermi surface into a pair of closed hole Fermi surfaces (recall that the figure illustrates only one-quarter of the tetragonal cell), each of area $x/2$. For the fourth energy level, $5.5eV$, the reconstruction converts the original Fermi surface into an electron-like Fermi surface, centered at X and Y , and a hole-like surface, centered at $\bar{M}$ (and symmetry-equivalent points). The interaction has split the vHs degeneracy, as can be seen in Fig. 1b, the energy dispersion corresponding to the Fermi surfaces of Fig. 2b. A gap has been opened up at the X -point of the zone, the location of the original vHs. However, the interactions cannot eliminate a vHs, but only split it into multiple vHs's. This will be further discussed in the following subsection.

For convenience in discussing the effects of various parameters on the band structure, I have used large values of the parameters to enhance the effects (as will be discussed later, such larger values may indeed be more appropriate). Figure 1c shows that when λ_2 is increased to $50meV$, the band structure is qualitatively unchanged, with only an enhanced band gap. As shown in Fig. 1d, the effect of λ_1 on the gap is roughly additive with λ_2 , while η (dashed lines in Fig. 1c) tends to narrow the antibonding band and shift it upward (as found earlier [4]) without modifying the region near the vHs's. (To avoid an overall band shift, I have assumed $\Delta + 2\eta = 4eV$ for the dashed lines.)

All of the above refer to the LTO phase. The effect of the λ_i 's on the LTT phase is nearly identical, as illustrated in Fig. 3a. The electron-phonon parameter η has a much larger effect in the LTT phase [4], Fig. 3b. For the present paper, however, my main interest is in the role of spin-orbit coupling on the LTO phase, so the LTT phase will not be discussed in as great detail.

E. Splitting of the vHs

The nature of the splitting of the vHs depends sensitively on the magnitude of the O-O hopping parameter, t_{OO} . This is illustrated for four different values of t_{OO} in Figs. 4 (energy dispersion), 5 (density of states), 6 (Fermi surfaces) and 7 (electron filling). The peaks in the dos correspond to vHs's, at which the topology of the Fermi surface changes. There can be up to *four* of these peaks, at different energies, in the LTO phase. In this section, the origin of each peak will be discussed. Note also that for $t_{OO} \leq 0.1$, the dos vanishes at a point between the vHs's. This is a signal for a *diabolical point* in the energy bands, which will be discussed in more detail below.

It is easiest to begin with $t_{OO}=0$, Figs. 4a, 5a, 6a. In this case, there is an approximate electron-hole symmetry, so doping only up to half filling need be discussed. For a nearly empty band, the first electrons go into pockets near the Γ and M points (all descriptions are based on the tetragonal zone – in the orthorhombic zone, these points are equivalent). With increased doping, these pockets fill up and expand toward the diagonal, $\bar{c}_x + \bar{c}_y = 0$, just as in the case without spin-orbit coupling. Near half filling, however, a first topology change occurs when small pockets appear near the X and Y points of the zone. This is shown in detail in Fig. 8a. At this point, all of the Fermi surfaces are closed and electron-like. Additional doping causes all surfaces to grow further, until the two surfaces meet to produce a rectangular box-like hole Fermi surface. This electron-hole crossover marks the point of the largest dos peak – the main vHs. With additional doping, there is a single hole-like Fermi surface (in this quadrant of the Brillouin zone), centered on the point $\bar{M}$. As doping increases, the area of the Fermi surface shrinks, until at half filling it is reduced to a single point at $\bar{M}$. This is the diabolical point: here, the spin-orbit coupling is unable to lift the degeneracy of the two bands, leading to a biconic structure, or ‘diabolo’, in the energy surface. At this point, the dos vanishes. For doping beyond half filling, the entire sequence is played out in reverse order. Fig. 7 illustrates the integrated electron density n directly. Since this is the integral of the dos, the steep rises correspond to the vHs peaks,

while the flat region is associated with the low dos regime near the diabolical point.

For finite t_{OO} , the doping dependence is similar, but more complicated, since there is no longer electron-hole symmetry: the diabolic point is shifted above the midway point between the two principal vHs's. Thus, in Figs. 6b-d, the topology changes are all similar for doping up to the lower main vHs, corresponding to the box-like or coffin-like Fermi surface (dotted lines). This is presumably the Fermi surface of main interest for superconductivity, since it falls in the doping regime $x \sim 0.02 - 0.25$, depending on the value of t_{OO} . Note also that increasing t_{OO} decreases the aspect ratio of the box, leading to a somewhat squarer Fermi surface, with the corners moving away from the X and Y points (see also Fig. 8b). The long sides acquire some curvature, giving the Fermi surface a coffin-like appearance.

New features arise in the more electron-doped regime. For $t_{OO} = 0.1$, Figs. 4b, 5b, 6b, doping beyond the box vHs leads first to the diabolical point, and hence a zero in the dos, just as for $t_{OO} = 0$. Beyond this point, however, a new topology change occurs, as electron-like Fermi surface pockets open up near the X and Y points (dashed lines). Finally the main vHs on the electron-doping side arises when these corner pockets intersect the growing electron pocket centered on $\bar{M}$ (solid lines).

Increasing t_{OO} further, a point is reached when the electron pockets at X and Y appear before the diabolical point is reached (Fig. 6c, $t_{OO} = 0.25$). Beyond this point, the Fermi surface becomes semi-metallic, with electron pockets near X and Y , and a hole pocket near $\bar{M}$. The dos no longer vanishes, and half filling corresponds to the doping at which the hole and electron pockets have equal areas. Doping beyond half filling, the hole pocket shrinks to a point (the remnant of the diabolical point) (dot-dashed lines), then an electron pocket grows from $\bar{M}$, until the electron pockets merge at the final vHs. The case for $t_{OO} = 0.65$ is similar. Fig. 8b shows how the box-like Fermi surface evolves with increasing t_{OO} .

A similar series of topological changes arises in the LTT phase, Fig. 9.

III. DIABOLICAL POINTS OF ENERGY BANDS

Whereas quantum mechanical energy levels tend to repel one another, to avoid degeneracies, level crossings can appear for sufficiently complex Hamiltonians. The analysis of such level crossings in molecules is an important aspect of understanding reaction rates of chemical transitions. For a diatomic atom the degeneracy of two electronic levels is extremely rare, but Teller showed that level crossings should regularly occur for larger, polyatomic molecules [13]. Such crossings are closely related to the JT effect, and Herzberg and Longuet-Higgins [14] demonstrated that the degeneracy leads to anomalous statistics: to make the electronic wave function single valued, the *orbital* angular momentum must be quantized in half-integral multiples of $\hbar$. An alternative approach is to introduce a pseudo magnetic field, so that single-valuedness of the electron is guaranteed by associating a quantized vortex of pseudoflux at the molecular site [15].

The degeneracy of the atomic levels leads to a linear dispersion of energy away from the point of degeneracy, so that the energy surface has a biconical form – Berry has called such points *diabolical points* [16]. A signature of such points is that the electronic phase changes by π when the electronic orbit traverses a path in energy around the point [17]. This phase change was an early example of what is now known as Berry’s phase [18]. Diabolical points have also been found in generalized two-dimensional Hubbard models, in the presence of orbital antiferromagnetism or spin nematic order [19], and similar phenomena are found in a number of elemental semiconductors, notably tin, which is a zero-gap semiconductor, and (approximately) graphite. A key parameter is the critical value of t_{OO} , at which the half filled band undergoes a semimetal (SM) – zero-band-gap-semiconductor (ZGS) transition. This will be calculated as a function of λ_i below.

The Fermi surfaces near a diabolical point have many of the right properties to explain a number of anomalous properties found in the cuprates, as summarized in the Discussion Section. For example, near the diabolical point, the LTO phase is stabilized by the umklapp splitting of the vHs; doping, if accomplished by a rigid band shift, leads to hole-pocket Fermi

surfaces, which provide the correct Hall density; and finally, sufficient doping repositions the Fermi level at the new vHs of the box/coffin-like Fermi surface, close to the doping of optimum T_c .

The form of two-fold degeneracy illustrated in Figs. 1a, 2a, is not unique to the LTO phase of LSCO, but is a common feature of a number of space groups containing glide planes. In all of these cases, spin-orbit coupling lifts most of this degeneracy, leaving a residual two-fold degeneracy on a few isolated points or lines. In the case of LSCO, when the LTO energy bands are treated as two-dimensional, the residual degeneracy is a clear example of a diabolical point, as illustrated in Figs. 4a,b. The situation can be somewhat more complex in three dimensions. Thus, for LSCO, when c-axis dispersion is included, there is an isolated degeneracy (diabolical point) at one point along the line perpendicular to Y^* , while the entire line passing through X^* retains a two-fold degeneracy. Since this dispersion is small, its inclusion should not greatly change the results of the present paper.

The diabolical point is a *novel form of vHs*, associated with overlapping bands. This can most easily be understood with reference to the dos, Fig. 5. In Fig. 5a,b the dos goes to zero at the diabolical point. This is the characteristic form of the dos at the top or bottom of a band, so the diabolical point can be understood as the point where one band terminates and another immediately begins. Note that the electron density n is defined as the number of electrons per Cu; since there are two Cu per unit cell in the LTO phase, the diabolical point appears when there are exactly two electrons per cell – an exactly filled band. However, when t_{OO} increases, the topological change occurs while the two bands still overlap in other parts of the Brillouin zone, Figs. 5c,d. In this case, the diabolical point is shifted away from half filling. The local contribution to the dos from the region of the diabolical point vanishes, but there is a finite total dos due to the contribution from other parts of the Fermi surface.

IV. SLAVE BOSON CALCULATIONS: CHOICE OF PARAMETERS

A. Spin Corrected Slave Boson Theory

Slave boson calculations offer a systematic procedure for incorporating correlations into a tight-binding model of the CuO_2 planes. The model has a number of desirable features, including renormalization of the bandwidth near half filling, and a metal-insulator (Mott) transition at exactly half filling above a critical value of the ratio Δ/t_{CuO} . A key limitation is that the theory is formally a large- N theory, where N is the degeneracy of the electron states on a Cu site, and the calculation is usually carried out only to lowest order (in $1/N$). At this order, the slave boson calculation does not include magnetic effects. Moreover, $N \simeq 2$ for the cuprates, so it is doubtful whether the lowest-order predictions of the theory are quantitatively correct. Nevertheless, detailed calculations are important – for example, to see how close the cuprates are to the metal-insulator transition, for a ‘realistic’ choice of parameters. In the present context, it is also important to determine how close the state at half filling is to the diabolical point.

In the large- N calculations, some parameters are renormalized by a factor N , which then does not explicitly appear in the final Hamiltonian. Nevertheless, in choosing the ‘correct’ parameters to use in the calculations, this factor should be included. In order to minimize confusion, I will write the ‘large- N ’ parameter as primed, and the bare parameter as unprimed. In particular, in comparing the present results to e.g., Ref. [20], one should take $t'_{\text{CuO}} = \sqrt{2}t_{\text{CuO}}$, $V' = 2V$, where V is the nearest-neighbor Coulomb repulsion.

In conventional slave boson calculations, the factor N includes both spin and orbital degeneracy (for the cuprates, $N = 2$ due to spin degeneracy [21]). However, I believe that it is *not* appropriate to include the spin degeneracy in the term t'_{CuO} . The factor N arises as follows: if the electron can hop from the Cu to N different orbitals on a given O, and all of these orbitals have the same energy and hopping t , then the antibonding band of the $N + 1 \times N + 1$ matrix has the same form as that of a 2×2 matrix, with a single effective O orbital, if the hopping energy is renormalized to $\sqrt{N}t$. Such an enhancement would arise in the cuprates only if spin flip hopping were as probable as spin-non-flip hopping. But the

spin-flip hopping is considerably less probable, and in fact is explicitly calculated here as spin-orbit coupling.

If spin-flip and non-spin-flip scattering are equally probable, then the electron loses spin memory on each hop, greatly modifying the magnetic properties of the model. Hence, I propose a ‘spin-corrected’ version of slave boson theory, in which spin-flip and non-spin-flip scattering are explicitly distinguished. In this case, the bare hopping parameter t'_{CuO} becomes

$$t'_{CuO} = \sqrt{\frac{N}{2}} t_{CuO}.$$

Since all bare parameters are normalized to t_{CuO} , this modification does not directly affect any of the predictions of the model. However, it is crucial when one attempts to determine whether the Mott transition occurs in the cuprates, by estimating ‘realistic’ values for the parameters. For instance, the Mott transition occurs only if Δ is larger than a critical value, $\sim 3.35t'_{CuO}$. For realistic values of Δ , a transition will occur only if the factor $\sqrt{N}$ is not included.

For convenience in the subsequent discussion, I will carefully distinguish the two cases, labelling the spin-corrected parameters with a superscript t (i.e., when it is assumed that $t'_{CuO} = t_{CuO}$), and without the superscript for the conventional slave boson theory (assuming $t'_{CuO} = \sqrt{2}t_{CuO}$). Thus, when $\Delta_0 = 6\sqrt{2}eV = 8.5eV$, then $\Delta_0^t = 6eV$.

In contrast, the nearest-neighbor Coulomb repulsion V is the same for both spins, so the factor $N = 2$ should remain for V' .

In searching through the literature, I was unable to find any explicit discussion of the proper choice of degeneracy factors. However, it is clear that different groups have made different choices, and that this choice is a cause for significant variations in the resulting slave boson calculations. To be specific, let b be the slave boson amplitude, and r_0 the renormalization of the hopping parameter. Then b is defined through the equation

$$\sum_{i=1}^N d_i^\dagger d_i + b^\dagger b = q_0 N,$$

where N is the electron degeneracy and q_0 is the filling factor (for the present case, $N = 2$,

$q_0 = 1/2$), while r_0 is defined by $t_R = r_0 t_{CuO}$. Given these definitions, then previous slave boson calculations have used a variety of values for the ratio $\eta_b = r_0/b$, with Refs. [22–24] assuming $\eta_b = 1$, Refs. [21,25] assuming $\eta_b = 1/\sqrt{2}$, and Refs. [26,20] (apparently) assuming $\eta_b = 1/2$ (since Ref. [20] uses the same symbol for t_{CuO} and t'_{CuO} , it is sometimes difficult to ascertain which is meant). In general, most of the calculations assuming $\eta_b = 1$ find that the metal-insulator transition does not occur at half filling, for reasonable parameter values, while the transition is found if a smaller η_b is assumed. The present calculations confirm *both* these results.

B. Bare Parameter Values: ‘Large’ Parameters

While the technique of carrying out the slave boson calculations to lowest order in $1/N$ is reasonably well understood, and considerable progress has been made in calculating the next-order corrections, relatively little attention has been paid to the proper choice of the starting, bare parameters. This choice is crucial, particularly in the immediate vicinity of half filling, where it controls whether or not a metal-insulator transition will occur. Under the present circumstances, the introduction of additional parameters – to describe spin-orbit and electron-phonon coupling – renders a detailed discussion of the choice of parameters even more urgent. Two separate problems arise: how to choose the bare parameters, and how the parameters vary with doping. This section will attempt to provide an introduction to the problems involved, but cannot pretend to provide a definitive solution.

The usual technique which has been adopted is to extract the bare parameter values from an LDA or cluster calculation of the band structure. However, simply parametrizing the the LDA-derived Fermi surfaces is *not* appropriate, since these calculations already include correlation effects in an average way. Fortunately, for LSCO a number of groups have analyzed the band structure calculations, to provide estimates for the bare parameters. Table I lists the values produced by several groups, using LDA or cluster calculations [27–29]. Earlier calculations are summarized in Ref. [30].

Even knowing these values is not sufficient: it must be recognized that the three-band model is a simplification of the physics, and the parameters which enter it are *effective* parameters, which describe the combined effect of several microscopic parameters. Two examples are of particular importance.

The nearest neighbor Coulomb repulsion V acts to renormalize the bare Cu-O separation [31], Δ_0 , according to [20]

$$\Delta_0 \rightarrow \Delta_0 + 2V(1 - x - 4r_0^2), \quad (7)$$

where r_0 is the mean field amplitude of the slave boson. While the term $2V(1 - x)$ is just a constant, and can be absorbed into an x -dependent Δ_0 , the last term depends self-consistently on the renormalization, and hence gives rise to a possible instability against phase separation [20]. However, the critical value of V required for this phase separation ($\sim 1.76t'_{CuO}/2 \sim 1.6eV$ [20] in the standard slave boson theory, or $\sim 1.6/\sqrt{2} = 1.1eV$ in the spin-corrected version) appears to be somewhat larger than the value estimated from LDA-type analyses, and moreover near half filling the value of r_0^2 tends to be very small. Hence, in the present calculations Eq. 7 will be approximated by enhancing the effective value of Δ_0 .

The second example involves the proper choice of the effective O-O hopping parameter. The LDA-derived value of t_{OO} is too large to give a good description of the curvature of the Fermi surfaces, suggesting that higher-lying bands play an important role in modifying the Fermi surface shape [32]. Aligia [33] has shown that this parameter is the sum of two effects of opposite sign: the direct O-O hopping, of value estimated in Table I, and the Cu $d_{x^2-y^2} - d_{z^2}$ interference term, which acts to reduce the curvature.

The problem of calculating the effective value for t_{OO} is similar to the problem of calculating t' in a $t - t' - J$ model, since the role of both parameters is to distort the Fermi surface away from square at half filling. In this case, Jefferson, et al. [34], have shown that even within a three-band model correlation effects can act to reduce t' toward zero, and can even change its sign.

In Appendix II, I derive an effective value of t_{OO} from a five-band model of the CuO_2 planes, including the Cu d_{z^2} and apical O orbitals [35]. A substantial reduction is found, and t_{OO} could even change sign. Due to uncertainties in many of the parameter values, it is difficult to use this calculation to fix the correct effective value for t_{OO} . Hence, I propose an approximate criterion for an acceptable value of t_{OO} : that the vHs fall at the same doping as in the LDA calculations, for the self-consistently renormalized slave boson values. The rationale for this is that correlation effects will be smallest away from half filling, so that the approximate manner in which LDA calculations incorporate correlation effects are likely to be most nearly correct near the vHs. The remarkable degree to which these calculations reproduce the experimentally measured Fermi surfaces confirm the plausibility of this choice. This estimate of the effective value of t_{OO} is in general agreement with the reduction estimated in Appendix II.

Figure 10 shows how x_{vHs} , the doping at which the Fermi level coincides with the vHs, varies with t_{OO} , assuming bare values of $t_{CuO} = 1.3\text{eV}$ and $\Delta = 4$ or 6eV . Using the bare parameters, the vHs falls in an acceptable regime (I estimate [1] $x_{vHs} = 0.16$ in LSCO and 0.25 in YBCO). However, correlation effects greatly reduce the value of t_{CuO} , and hence enhance the ratio t_{OO}/t_{CuO} , which controls the Fermi surface curvature. Thus, to recover reasonable values for x_{vHs} , it is necessary to assume smaller values for t_{OO} . For definiteness, I have assumed bare values of $\Delta_0^t = 4\text{eV}$ or 6eV , in which case $t_{OO}^t \simeq 0.14 - 0.2\text{eV}$ for LSCO, and $0.3-0.4\text{eV}$ for YBCO.

It is tempting to speculate that the lower T_c in LSCO is related to the finding that the effective t_{OO} is only half as large in LSCO as in YBCO. A smaller t_{OO} can reduce T_c directly, because the excess hole population is smaller at the vHs, or indirectly, since a smaller t_{OO} means a more nearly square Fermi surface at half filling, thereby enhancing the possibility of a structural instability which competes with superconductivity. If t_{OO} is lowered by repulsion from the d_{z^2} level, then this parameter is particularly sensitive to the environment off of the CuO_2 planes – e.g., other layers, and the apical oxygen. Indeed, there is a close correlation between Δ_d , the $d_{x^2-y^2} - d_{z^2}$ splitting, and the distance d_A between the Cu and the apical

oxygen (Appendix III). This correlation can be interpreted in terms of a static JT-like effect (N.B.: not to be confused with the vHs-JT effect) which produces the distortion of the six O's surrounding the Cu from a perfect octahedron [36,37]. Hence, anything which reduces the Cu-apical O separation also reduces the $d - d$ splitting, in turn reducing the effective value of t_{OO} . The correlation between small T_c and small optimum hole doping has been known for a long time, and it is also known that the apical oxygen plays some role, since a larger apical O potential correlates with higher T_c [38].

C. Bare Parameter Values: Spin-Orbit and Phonon Coupling

An important role in the theory is played by the magnitude of the spin-orbit coupling. Specifically, if $\lambda \equiv \lambda_1 + \lambda_2$ is large enough, the state at half filling will be a zero-gap semiconductor (ZGS) rather than a semimetal. The location of the zero-gap semiconductor – semimetal (ZS) phase boundary depends sensitively on the relative magnitudes of λ and t_{OO} . For $\lambda = 50meV$, the ZS crossover occurs at $t_{OO} \simeq 0.13eV$; for $\lambda = 6meV$, the crossover occurs for t_{OO} about an order of magnitude smaller.

The parameter λ has been estimated by Bonesteel, et al. [8], as

$$\lambda_2 \simeq \left(\frac{\Delta g}{g}\right)t_{CuO}\theta, \quad (8)$$

where θ is the octahedral tilt angle, and Δg is the shift in the electronic g -factor g due to spin-orbit coupling. With the estimates $\Delta g/g \sim 0.1$ [39], $t_{CuO} = 1.3eV$ (I use the bare value of t_{CuO} to estimate the bare value of λ), and experimental values for θ , Eq. 8 gives $\lambda_{LTO} \simeq 6meV$, $\lambda_{LTT} \sim 24meV$.

There are a number of factors which could substantially enhance the value of λ_{LTO} . First, if there is a dynamic JT effect, the experimentally observed value of θ will be smaller than the microscopic local values, which would be more representative of local LTT-like distortions. Secondly, dynamical JT effects can greatly reduce the observed spin-orbit corrections to g -values (the Ham effect [40]). Thirdly, λ is playing a role similar to umklapp scattering in

splitting the vHs degeneracy, and in the analogous one-dimensional problem, it is well known that renormalization effects greatly enhance an initially small umklapp term (for a discussion of the connection between the vHs problem and one-dimensional umklapp scattering, see [41]). Finally, as will be seen in the following subsection, what is important in the present problem is how the parameters renormalize in the presence of strong correlation effects. I am assuming that λ is renormalized in such a way that λ/t_{CuO} remains constant. This assumption is by no means self-evident – Bonesteel, et al. [8], suggest that λ is unaffected by strong coupling. From the perspective of the present analysis, any increase in the ratio λ/t_{CuO} is equivalent to starting with a larger effective bare value of λ . For all these reasons, it is plausible to assume that λ_{LTO} is large enough that the state at half filling is close to the ZGS phase. Clearly, a detailed microscopic estimation of the parameters, particularly λ and t_{OO} is a desideratum.

The electron-phonon coupling parameter can be estimated as [4,5]

$$\eta = \frac{2\beta_\pi^2 t_{CuO}^2 \theta^2}{\Delta} \simeq 2.16\theta^2 eV, \quad (9)$$

where $\beta_\pi \simeq 1.6$. This is close to the recent estimate of Song and Annett [12], $\eta \simeq 2.8\theta^2 eV$. Using $\theta_{LTO} \simeq 0.5$ [8], $\eta_{LTO} \simeq 5.4 meV$. In the LTT phase, θ_{LTT} is about four times larger, yielding $\eta_{LTT} \simeq 86 meV$. The latter value would also be approximately correct for a dynamic JT effect in the LTO phase.

D. Doping Dependence: Scaling with t_{CuO}

In the absence of spin-orbit coupling and electron-phonon interaction, the slave boson theory provides a system of self-consistent equations for determining how Δ and t_{CuO} vary with doping, due to correlation effects (Eqs. 11, below). An important question is how t_{OO} , and, in an extended theory, λ and η vary with doping. This question can be conveniently separated into two parts: since strong correlation effects can renormalize t_{CuO} to zero, while Δ remains finite, one must first ascertain how the parameters scale with t_{CuO} , and then check if there are residual finite renormalizations, as with Δ .

The scaling can be determined from the theoretical expressions for the parameters,

$$\lambda \sim \frac{\lambda_0 t_z}{\Delta_d}, \quad (10)$$

and Eq. 6b for η . Here λ_0 is the spin-orbit coupling constant [7], t_z is the hopping parameter between the planar O $p\sigma$ orbitals and the Cu d_{z^2} orbital, and Δ_d is the Cu $d_{z^2} - d_{x^2-y^2}$ splitting energy. Now correlation effects inhibit the placing of two holes on the same Cu, and this causes the renormalization of t_{CuO} to zero at half filling. Thus, t' should also scale to zero, since it involves the same Cu orbital. The case with t_z is slightly different, since it involves a different Cu orbital, but the Hubbard U for this orbital is also large, and the simplest assumption is that t_z also scales to zero at half filling.

Hence, the following assumption will be made for the scaling of the parameters. First, λ is renormalized proportionally to t_{CuO} , while η scales as t_{CuO}^2 (!) Finally, t_{OO} should not rescale with t_{CuO} .

Because of the strong rescaling of η , it might be thought that this electron-phonon coupling could be neglected near half filling, in comparison with the electron-phonon coupling term, λ . However, as the scaling analysis of Section VB shows, the gaps produced by both terms scale in the same fashion near half-filling. Because of the different ways they enter the Hamiltonian, Eqs. 2 and 6, the effective electron-phonon interaction strengths are $g \sim \eta$ and $g^{so} \sim \lambda t_{CuO} / \Delta$, both of which scale as $g \sim r_0^2$ near half filling. The electron-phonon coupling parameter has a similar scaling, $\lambda_{ep} \sim g^2 N(E_F) \sim r_0^2$, since $N(E_F)$, the dos at the Fermi level, varies as $N(E_F) \sim 1/t_{CuO}^2$. A similar scaling has been found in a number of earlier studies [42]. I believe that this suppression of electron-phonon coupling by correlations is an artifact of the mean-field theory. Anderson [43] has found that correlations actually enhance nesting effects, and Eliashberg [44] finds that electron-phonon coupling can remain strong in the presence of strong correlation effects. This issue will be discussed further in a future article.

A separate issue is the doping dependence of the LTO transition temperature, which drops to zero around $x \simeq 0.2$. Since $\lambda \sim \theta$ and $\eta \sim \theta^2$, these parameters will suffer a further

reduction with doping. Ultimately, of course, the LTO transition temperature should be calculated self consistently in the presence of correlation effects.

E. Residual Doping Dependence

In addition to the strong rescaling noted above, there can also be finite renormalizations with doping, similar to the renormalization of Δ . As will be shown below, the renormalized Δ is typically a factor of three smaller than its bare value. This renormalization of Δ will have an impact on several of the other parameters. For instance, $\eta \propto \Delta^{-1}$ will be increased by the same factor of three. The effect on other parameters depends on how Δ_d varies with doping. Since $\Delta_d \ll \Delta$, it is necessary for the d_{z^2} level to shift in tandem with the $d_{x^2-y^2}$ level, to keep the states at the Fermi level of $d_{x^2-y^2}$ symmetry. However, in this shift, it is not clear whether the two levels maintain a constant separation, or whether Δ_d is itself reduced proportional to Δ . The latter situation arises naturally when a single slave boson is introduced for all d-levels, and has been assumed in a recent study of the role of the apical oxygens [35] In this case, $\lambda \propto \Delta_d^{-1}$ would be further increased by the same factor.

A similar effect would arise for the effective value of t_{OO} . While the microscopic t_{OO} is unlikely to be strongly affected by Cu Coulomb correlations (but see [34]), the counterterm, due to repulsion from the d_{z^2} levels, will be enhanced by reducing Δ_d . The form of the reduction is suggested in Table II (where an explicit form for X is given in Appendix II).

In summary, there is much left to be understood about the proper choice of parameter values, and how they change in the presence of strong correlations. The fact that reducing Δ increases some other parameters could even lead to an instability, just as occurs with sufficiently large values of V , Eq. 7. Lacking more precise knowledge, the following prescription will be followed here. Only renormalization of Δ and t_{CuO} will be explicitly accounted for in the slave boson calculations. It will, however, be assumed that λ scales with t_{CuO} , and η with t_{CuO}^2 . This will be shown to lead to an interesting scaling regime when t_{CuO} is sufficiently small. The other, minor renormalizations discussed in the present subsection

will be approximately accounted for by adjusting the values of the bare parameters. Since the renormalization is strongest near half filling, the bare parameters will be taken as those appropriate to half filling, and effects due to their variation with doping will be neglected. A summary of the present parameter estimates is given in Table II.

V. SLAVE BOSON CALCULATIONS IN THE THREE BAND MODEL

A. Slave Boson Technique

The strong on-site Coulomb repulsion acts to greatly reduce the probability of double occupancy of an atomic orbital. The effect is most important for Cu, since U is larger for copper and since the Cu band is very close to half filled, so the probability of finding an unoccupied Cu site is small. Hence, for simplicity U will be neglected on the O sites, and set to infinity on Cu – this has the effect of forbidding any double occupancy of the Cu's. In a slave boson calculation, this constraint is enforced by introducing a boson to occupy the second orbital of each singly occupied site. By satisfying the constraint in mean field, it is possible to reduce the calculation to a self-consistent renormalization of the bands. Basically, the Cu-O hopping parameter is reduced by the renormalization, while Δ tends to increase, as the antibonding band becomes more purely Cu-like.

The equations of self-consistency can be written

$$r_0^2 = \frac{1}{2} [1 - \sum_k u_k^2 f_h(E_k)], \quad (11a)$$

$$\Delta_0 - \Delta = \frac{1}{2r_0^2} \sum_k u_k^2 f_h(E_k)(E_k - \Delta), \quad (11b)$$

where the renormalized parameters are $t_R = r_0 t'_{CuO}$ and Δ , $f_h(E_k)$ is the Fermi function, and u_k is the d-wave amplitude of the wave function. E_k and u_k are calculated using the renormalized parameters, and it is assumed that t_{OO} is not renormalized. Only the case $T = 0$ will be considered in the present paper. As written, Eqs. 11 are valid for a hole

picture, so $f_h(E_k) = 1$ for $E_k > E_F$, and $= 0$ otherwise. There is an equivalent electron picture, discussed in Appendix IV. The sums are normalized per Cu atom, so for example

$$\sum_k (1) = 6, \quad (12a)$$

that is, that there are three bands (spin 1/2), and

$$\sum_k f_h(E_k) = 1 + x. \quad (12b)$$

Equations 11 are written in such a way as to remain valid in the presence of spin-orbit coupling and electron-phonon coupling. These equations are solved self-consistently by guessing initial values for the renormalized values and numerically performing the double integrals to allow calculation of the corresponding bare values, then readjusting the initial guesses until the known values of the bare parameters are recovered. [This improves upon my earlier work [46], which approximated the problem by a single integral.] If t_R is small enough, however, the equations simplify to a scaling form, for which only a single parameter, Δ , need be varied. This scaling regime is discussed in the following Subsection.

B. Scaling Regime

When $t_R \sim 0$, and $\Delta \gg 4t_{OO}$, the antibonding band is very narrow, $\delta \equiv E - \Delta \ll E$. In this case, the dispersion relations, such as Eq. 4, can be solved to lowest order in δ , setting $E \rightarrow \Delta$ in all the remaining terms. The resulting solution possesses a simple scaling form.

It is convenient to first treat the special case, $\lambda = \eta = 0$ – the untilted case. In this case, the normalized dispersion $\gamma = \delta/\hat{t}$ (with $\hat{t} = 4t_R^2/\Delta$) depends only on the parameter $y = 4t_{OO}/\Delta$:

$$\gamma = \frac{s_x^2 + s_y^2 + 2ys_x^2s_y^2}{1 - y^2s_x^2s_y^2}. \quad (13)$$

The resulting bandwidth is $2\hat{t}/(1 - y)$, and the band is nearly pure Cu-like, with

$$u_k^2 = 1 - \frac{\epsilon\hat{t}}{\Delta}, \quad (14a)$$

$$\epsilon = \frac{1}{(1 - y s_x s_y)^2} [s_x^2 + s_y^2 - \frac{2 y s_x s_y (s_x - s_y)^2}{(1 + y s_x s_y)^2}]. \quad (14b)$$

Letting $\bar{\gamma} = \sum_k \gamma f_h(E_k)$ be the average of γ over the occupied states, with a similar definition of $\bar{\epsilon}$, the self-consistency equations become

$$\Delta_0 = \Delta + \frac{4 t_{CuO}^2 \bar{\gamma}}{\Delta}, \quad (15a)$$

$$t_R^2 = \frac{x}{\frac{4\bar{\epsilon}}{\Delta^2} - \frac{2}{t_{CuO}^2}}, \quad (15b)$$

where x is the hole doping. Note that once Δ is known, Eq. 15b is an explicit equation for t_R , and that in the scaling regime $t_R \rightarrow 0$ at half filling.

Remarkably, using the scaling of the small parameters discussed above, the same scaling regime holds for the full dispersion relation, Eq. 4. Thus, Eq. A1 in Appendix I is a quadratic equation for δ , and it can easily be seen that when λ scales $\propto t_R$, and $\eta \propto t_R^2$, then $\delta \propto \hat{t}$, as found above. Now, however, the energy dispersion is a function of three variables y , λ/t_R , and η/t_R^2 . The bare parameter values are sufficiently close to this scaling regime that most of the results of Figs. 1-9 are only qualitatively changed if the renormalized parameters are used in place of the bare ones (except when $t_{OO} = 0.65\text{eV}$, for which $4t_{OO} \ll \Delta$ is not always satisfied).

C. Slave Boson Results: (a) Strong Correlation ($t \rightarrow 0$) Limit

The above scaling results can be used to analyze the strong correlation limit – specifically, to explore the circumstances in which t_R is renormalized to zero. In particular, Eq. 15b shows that $t_R = 0$ *can only occur at half filling*, $x = 0$. This also follows directly from Eq. 11a when $r_0 = 0$ and $u_k = 1$, and is consistent with the result for the one-dimensional Hubbard model [45].

Equation 15a shows that there is a *minimum value of Δ_0* for which $t_R = 0$ is possible. Defining $\Delta_m^2 = 4 t_{CuO}^2 \bar{\gamma}_0$, where $\bar{\gamma}_0$ is $\bar{\gamma}$ evaluated for a half filled band, then the minimum value of Δ is Δ_m , and at this point $\Delta_0 = 2\Delta_m$. Numerically evaluating $\bar{\gamma}_0$ as a function of

y thus provides a plot of Δ_0/t'_{CuO} vs $t_{OO}/t_{CuO} = y\Delta_m/4t'_{CuO}$, Fig. 11. For $y = 0$, $\bar{\gamma}_0$ can be evaluated analytically, yielding [25]

$$\frac{\Delta_0}{t'_{CuO}} = 4\sqrt{\frac{1}{2} + \frac{2}{\pi^2}} = 3.353, \quad (16a)$$

or $\Delta_0^t = 4.36eV$ when $t_{CuO} = 1.3eV$. Note that for the conventional theory, $\Delta_0 = \sqrt{2} \times 4.36 = 6.17eV$. If a larger value, $t_{CuO} = 1.4eV$, is assumed, then $\Delta_0 = 6.64eV$, in good agreement with the $6.5eV$ found by Sudbø and Houghton [22].

The above result is, however, only a lower limit to the critical Δ_0 when $t_{OO} \neq 0$. The analysis assumes that the system is in the scaling regime, which is not necessarily the case when t_{OO} is comparable to $\Delta/4$. A more accurate phase boundary can be found from numerically solving the self-consistent Eqs. 11, and this is also illustrated in Fig. 11. Care must be taken in deriving these points, since the numerical calculations become unstable when $t_R \sim 0$. The procedure followed here is to choose a value for the renormalized t_R and adjust Δ until $t_{CuO} = 1.3eV$. A number of values of t_R were chosen in the range 0.075 - $0.2eV$, and it was found that a plot of Δ_0 vs t_R^2 gave a straight line, which was extrapolated to $t_R = 0$ to generate the points plotted in Fig. 11 as open circles. These closely approximate a straight line

$$\Delta_0 = 3.353t'_{CuO} + 2.94t_{OO}. \quad (16b)$$

This metal-insulator phase diagram is in semi-quantitative agreement with Monte Carlo calculations on the three band Hubbard model, at least at $t_{OO} = 0$, where most of the calculations have been done. Assuming a large but finite value for the on-site Coulomb repulsion, $U_d = 6t_{CuO}$, a charge-transfer insulating gap appears to open up for Δ/t_{CuO} between 1 and 4 [47], or between 2 and 3 [48]. The resulting gap values are also comparable. This good agreement holds *for the spin-corrected theory*, while the conventional slave boson theory is off by a factor $\sim \sqrt{2}$.

The ZS crossover can also be determined analytically. The diabolical point is the solution

of Eq. A1 (Appendix I) at the $\bar{M}$ point ($\bar{c}_x = \bar{c}_y = 0$), or

$$E_d \delta_d = \frac{2(\lambda_A^2 + 2t^2) + y'(\lambda_B^2 + 8t^2)}{1 - 4y'^2}, \quad (17a)$$

where the subscript d refers to the diabolical point, the various λ_i 's are defined in Appendix I, and $y' = t_{OO}/E_d$. Equation 17a is true in general; in the scaling regime, each explicit E_d should be replaced by Δ . The ZGS state is present when there are no other solutions of Eq. A1 along the diagonal $\bar{c}_x + \bar{c}_y = 0$. When such solutions exist, the diabolical point falls in a semimetallic regime. The crossover occurs when the second solution falls at the X or Y point, in which case

$$E_d \delta_d = 2(\lambda_A^2 + 2t^2) \pm 4\sqrt{2}t\lambda. \quad (17b)$$

The upper solution is relevant here; the lower one falls close to the box-like Fermi surfaces. Equating Eqs. 17a,b yields the equation of the crossover

$$y^2[\hat{\lambda}_1^2 + \hat{\lambda}_2^2 + \sqrt{2}(\hat{\lambda}_1 + \hat{\lambda}_2) + 1] + y[2 - \hat{\lambda}_1\hat{\lambda}_2] - 4\sqrt{2}(\hat{\lambda}_1 + \hat{\lambda}_2) = 0, \quad (17c)$$

where $\hat{\lambda}_i = \lambda_i/t_{CuO}$. The resulting crossover phase diagram is shown in Fig. 12.

D. Slave Boson Results: (b) Metal-Insulator Transition

The full Equations 11 have been solved for a variety of bare parameters Δ_0 , t_{CuO} and t_{OO} , as a function of hole doping x . The following results are found. (1) For $x \neq 0$, the system is metallic, with $t_R > 0$. (2) There is a critical value Δ_c (Eq. 16), such that $t_R \rightarrow 0$ as $x \rightarrow 0$, if $\Delta_0 > \Delta_c$. (3) For $\Delta > \Delta_c$, the Fermi level jumps discontinuously as x passes through zero, with the discontinuity being the charge-transfer gap. (4) The renormalization is such as to keep the Fermi level pinned near the vHs – the more so as Δ increases. This pinning was found in earlier slave boson [46,23,24] and other [49] calculations.

Using the parameters estimated above (Table II), the present calculations predict a metal-insulator transition at half filling, but only if $tCuO' = t_{CuO}$ (the parameters with superscript t in Fig. 11). If, on the other hand, it is assumed that $tCuO' = \sqrt{2}t_{CuO}$, then the half filled band remains metallic, $\Delta < \Delta_c$.

The metal-insulator transition is illustrated in Fig. 13, both in the presence of spin-orbit coupling, $\lambda_2 = 0.05eV$ (symbols) and in its absence (lines), assuming $t_{OO}^t = 0.25eV$, as Δ_0^t increases from $4eV$ (solid line or open squares) to $5eV$ (dashed line of filled circles) to $6eV$ (dot-dashed line or open circles). The transition in the absence of spin-orbit coupling will be discussed first. Figure 13a shows that t_R renormalizes to zero exactly at half filling ($\Delta_0^t = 5eV$ is just below the transition, so t_R has a small but finite value at half filling). The scaling theory, Eq. 15b, approximates the doping dependence of t_R near half filling (dotted line). Near this point, the Fermi energy changes rapidly (Fig. 13b), from a value near Δ_0 (Cu-like carriers) when $x < 0$ to a much smaller value (more O-like) for $x > 0$. This change is discontinuous above the Mott transition; this is the charge-transfer insulator gap [21], and should be compared to the one-dimensional Hubbard model (see Fig. 3 of Ref. [41]). For even larger x , Δ becomes negative, and the Fermi level falls directly in the O-like band. [In this regime, the three-band model should not be trusted, because of the proximity of the d_{z^2} band to the Fermi level. Indeed, in this doping regime an enhanced d_{z^2} character is often observed experimentally.]

The quasi-pinning of the Fermi level to the vHs is illustrated in Figs. 13c,d. In a rigid-band filling picture, the bandwidth and the position of the vHs would both be independent of doping, so the separation between the vHs and Fermi level would smoothly track the variation of the Fermi level with doping. This is not what happens in the presence of strong correlation effects. Figure 13c shows that the position of the vHs (defined by the hole doping x_{vHs} at which the vHs would coincide with the Fermi level) actually changes with doping, while Fig. 13d shows the energy separation between the Fermi level and the vHs, $\Delta E = E_F - E_{vHs}$. Note for example the case $\Delta_0^t = 6eV$: over the doping range $x = -0.1$ to $x = +0.3$, the Fermi energy varies by $4eV$, while $|\Delta E| \leq 10meV$! Thus, correlations strongly pin the vHs near the Fermi level, especially when a Mott transition occurs at half filling.

Figure 14 illustrates the corresponding Fermi surfaces, both at the vHs (i.e., when $\Delta E = 0$) and at half filling. Note that these latter Fermi surfaces are far from square, and their

proximity to the vHs arises mainly from the very small bandwidth.

The changes in t_R and E_F due to inclusion of spin-orbit coupling are relatively small, Fig. 13a,b. (It should be noted that the routine for solving Eqs. 11 does not converge well for large Δ_0 near $x = 0$, or for smaller Δ_0 at large x .) There is a curious symmetry between the doping of the vHs in the absence of spin-orbit coupling x_{vHs} and that of the diabolical point x_{dia} in its presence: $x_{dia} \simeq -x_{vHs}$, Fig. 13c. For the assumed value $t_{OO}^t = 0.25eV$, the system is a semimetal at half filling. Figure 15 shows how the bands and Fermi level evolve with doping for $\Delta_0^t = 6eV$. At $x = 0.3$ (Fig. 15a), the Fermi level lies in the gap between the two vHs at the X -point, but there is still a cylindrical Fermi surface centered at $\bar{M}$, dashed line in Fig. 15d. Reducing x to 0.15 (Fig. 15b) or 0.05 (Fig. 15c), the Fermi level has now crossed one of the vHs near X , leading to the presence of both electron and hole pockets, Fig. 15d.

In Figure 16, the same sequence is repeated for $t_{OO}^t = 0.1$. As $x \rightarrow 0^+$, t_{OO} is still too large to have a zero-gap semiconductor, in agreement with the scaling results, Fig. 12. However, on the Cu side of the charge transfer insulator ($x \leq 0$), the much larger value of Δ leads to a smaller value of y , with a corresponding *zero-gap semiconductor at $x = 0^-$* – i.e., the diabolical point falls at the Fermi level at (slightly less than) half filling! Figure 16e shows the band structure for $x = -0.05$ – which is as close to half filling as the numerical routine can be successfully used. The diabolical point is clearly in a true gap in the dos. The Fermi surface for $x = -0.05$ is composed solely of an electron-like surface (dotted lines in Fig. 16f) – the lack of hole-like sections is further evidence that the net electron concentration at half filling can vanish only by the Fermi surface shrinking to a point (ZGS) and not by compensation of electron and hole sections (SM).

E. Discussion: Mott Transition?

Early slave-boson calculations [21], which neglected direct O-O hopping ($t_{OO} = 0$), identified the Mott transition as the point at which t_{CuO} is renormalized to zero. Later calculations

included direct oxygen-oxygen hopping, t_{OO} [50,46,26], but it was found that slave boson calculations lead to a metallic state at half filling [23], when the bare value $t_{OO} = 0.65\text{eV}$ is assumed. As argued above, the value of t_{OO} used in these calculations should be a smaller, effective value, incorporating the role of coupling to the d_{z^2} states. Moreover, the value of N in the relationship $t'_{CuO} = \sqrt{N}t_{CuO}$ should, as argued above be taken equal to 1, and not 2, as is usually done. When these two corrections are made, the present results give a metal-insulator transition at half filling, for reasonable parameter values.

This result is consistent with the results of other, non-slave boson calculations of the three-band model. Thus, the studies that produced the parameters of Table I [27–30] also explored the low energy sector of the three-band model, and all find an insulating state at half filling with a large charge transfer gap, comparable to experiment. See also Refs. [51], which find similar results. For all of these parameter sets, the slave boson calculation with $N = 2$ would have incorrectly predicted a metallic state at half filling.

Zhang, et al. [52] recently suggested that the slave boson calculations are in error near half filling, and that the state at half filling is always insulating (at least if t_{OO} is not too large). Furthermore, when the slave boson calculation does predict an insulating state at half filling, its detailed predictions are in good agreement with more accurate treatments. It is still possible that, for finite t_{OO} , there is some minimum value Δ_c , below which there is no metal insulator transition, since the Bi and Tl based cuprate superconductors do not show evidence for an antiferromagnetic insulating phase.

VI. CONCLUSIONS

The present results have an important bearing on the question of the role of the vHs in driving structural transitions in the cuprate superconductors. A major stumbling block has been the assumption [10] that the vHs degeneracy is not split in the LTO phase. Spin-orbit coupling does produce such a splitting, playing the role of the umklapp scattering postulated earlier [4]. However, vHs's cannot be destroyed in a two-dimensional band, but only split

up. The ensuing Fermi surface reconstruction leads to a large variety of new vHs's. Perhaps the most interesting possibility is a *diabolical point*, at which the Fermi surface collapses to a single point.

While these Fermi surface reconstructions are undoubtedly present, just how important they are depends on the proximity of the Fermi surfaces, as a function of doping, to the topological changes of the bands. The answer to this question, in turn, depends on the choice of the band parameters, and how they are modified by correlation effects. These are difficult questions, and the present work is intended as an introduction to the problems involved, as well as a *first estimate* for many of the parameters.

Among the questions which depend on these parameter choices are the following. Will the state at half filling be metallic or insulating? Is the LTO transition driven by the vHs splitting? At what doping does the vHs coincide with the Fermi level. Figure 11 provides an answer to the first question: the critical value of Δ_0/t'_{CuO} above which t_{CuO} is renormalized to zero by correlation effects, at precisely half filling. The critical value appears to be in the range of parameter estimates for both LSCO and YBCO. The transition is *not* driven by Fermi surface nesting, in that the transition always appears at half filling, even though the nesting is better at other dopings. However, there is an element of nesting involved, in that the critical value of Δ_0 increases rapidly as t_{OO} increases from zero.

While I have demonstrated that the vHs degeneracy is split by the LTO distortion, it remains to be seen whether the energy lowering associated with this splitting can drive the structural transition. This will be the case for one special doping, when the vHs lies exactly at the Fermi level in the undistorted structure. However, I suggested [5] a more interesting possibility: that correlations can pin the Fermi level close to the vHs over an extended doping range, so that the LTO transition could be Fermi-surface-driven over this full range. While this pinning is clearly present, Fig. 13d, the Fermi surface at half filling is not close enough to the vHs (Fig. 14) for this simple model to work. However, the present calculations suggest two closely related possibilities.

One possibility is that a diabolical point falls at half filling, so the half filled band is a

zero-gap semiconductor, and hence naturally an insulator at low temperatures. If doping then produces a simple rigid band filling, the resulting small hole pockets can explain the observed Hall densities, and yet if the gaps are small the Fermi surfaces will appear to be large. Sufficient hole doping would bring the holes to a new vHs, associated with the box/coffin-like Fermi surface, Fig. 8b. However, it seems that t_{OO} is too large for the diabolical point to fall at $x = 0^+$.

The second possibility, illustrated in Fig. 16, is that the diabolical point falls at $x = 0^-$. In this case, the LTO structure would be stabilized both at $x = 0^-$ and at $x = x_{vHs}$, *but not at intermediate doping*. In such a situation, an electronic phase separation may arise, to keep part of the holes at the vHs density [46]. This possibility arises for realistic values of t_{OO} , but requires a somewhat enhanced value for the spin-orbit coupling parameter λ . However, in the analogous one-dimensional metal problem, it is known that umklapp scattering is strongly renormalized to drive the metal-insulator transition at half filling.

A very attractive possibility is that *the renormalization arises from antiferromagnetism*. It is known [53,37] that antiferromagnetism also lifts the band degeneracy along the $X - M$ face of the Brillouin zone. Attempts to self-consistently calculate antiferromagnetism – to see if the gap opening lowers the energy sufficiently to stabilize the antiferromagnetic state – generally find that the paramagnetic state is more stable. Part of the problem is that the gapping is imperfect: residual Fermi surface sections are left behind. If, because of spin orbit interaction, the system is already close to a complete gap (a diabolical point), then it is possible that the additional effect of antiferromagnetic correlations will open a complete gap, and thereby enhance the stability of the antiferromagnetic state. It should be recalled that, upon doping away from the insulating state, the first carriers produce small hole pockets near the $\bar{M}$ points, just as would be expected for the diabolical point [54]. In the problem of the quantum Heisenberg antiferromagnet, it is known that Berry phases lead to dangerously irrelevant couplings [55].

VII. DISCUSSION

Spin-orbit coupling introduces a major reconstruction of the Fermi surfaces of the cuprates, and hence opens up a wide variety of questions, as well as suggesting possible answers to a number of problems involving the cuprates. Here, I briefly indicate some of the major issues. It should be noted that incorporation of this scattering clearly demonstrates the important role of the vHs in the structural transitions, in addition to their role in superconductivity. In brief, the LTO (and LTT) phase(s) are the equivalent of the charge-density wave phases in the vHs problem, and the physics of the cuprates is dominated by the competition between superconductivity and density-wave formation, in close analogy to one-dimensional metals.

A. Umklapp scattering and the Hall anomalies

It has previously been suggested that umklapp scattering could provide an explanation for some of the anomalous features of the Hall effect in the cuprates [56]. Basically, by introducing gaps at the vHs's, this scattering would change the Fermi surfaces from large areas (proportional to $1+x$) to much smaller areas, $\sim x/2$. That spin-orbit coupling produces just such an effect is clear from, e.g., Fig. 2, thus confirming the suggested explanation.

Moreover, the temperature dependence of the Hall density can, in principle, be understood as a measure of the temperature-dependent gap associated with the LTO phase transition. As T is lowered below the HTT-LTO phase transition, the gap opens gradually, converting the hole gas from the large-area Fermi surface to the hole pockets, and then, as T falls further, reducing the areas of the pockets.

B. Mott and Antiferromagnetic Transitions

This gradual gap opening can explain many anomalous features of the normal phase above T_c , and particularly in the lightly doped regime near $x \simeq 0$. This would be particularly true if, as a result of the combined effect of spin-orbit coupling and large, Hubbard-like correlation effects, the Fermi surface at half filling falls at a diabolical point, with vanishing area (as in Fig. 4a,b).

In particular, the mobility shows very little change at the LTO transition, but there is a metal-insulator transition (change of sign of the temperature coefficient of resistivity) at much lower temperatures. This can be understood as another manifestation of a slow gap opening (enhanced in this case by the fact that the gap vanishes at the diabolical points). Near the transition temperature, the gap affects only the immediate vicinity of the vHs's, but these holes make very little contribution to the mobility, because of the very strong inter-vHs scattering [57]. Indeed, by eliminating the vHs as a source of scattering, this could actually enhance the mobility of holes on other parts of the Fermi surface.

Gradually, however, the shrinking area of the residual Fermi surfaces with decreasing T would cause the mobility to decrease, ultimately leading to a localization transition at half filling, when the areas shrink to zero.

Just as in the usual localization picture, the spins should freeze out prior to the final localization, leading to a local moment formation on the Cu's. This may explain why the Heisenberg model for the antiferromagnetic transition has been so successful in these materials. In the past, the success of this model has led to suggestions for 'two carrier dynamics' – in which the holes on the Cu were localized, while the doped holes on the oxygens formed a separate band. Here, it is seen that both features arise naturally from spin-orbit scattering in the LTO phase.

C. LTO-LTT Competition?

Since spin-orbit coupling directly splits the vHs degeneracy, it is not necessary to postulate the existence of a dynamic JT effect, in order for the LTO phase to be electronically driven. Nevertheless, frozen phonon calculations find that the LTT distortion is energetically favored over the LTO or any other local configuration [37]. Moreover, while spin-orbit scattering does not strongly affect the LTT-LTO splitting (Fig. 3a), the ordinary electron-phonon coupling provides an additional energy lowering for the LTT phase (Fig. 3b). Thus, the possibility of dynamic JT scattering remains, and will be reanalyzed once the dynamics of the transition to a uniform LTO phase is better understood.

It must not be forgotten that even in molecular systems there is a strong competition between the JT effect and spin-orbit coupling, and it will require considerably more work to sort out their respective roles in the cuprates.

D. Incommensurate Diffraction Peaks

Neutron diffraction studies have found that in La_2CuO_4 , the antiferromagnetic peaks are commensurate, at $Q = (\pi/a, \pi/a)$. As the material becomes Sr doped, the peaks split and become incommensurate, at $Q \pm \delta(\pi/a, 0)$ or $Q \pm \delta(0, \pi/a)$, with the incommensurability δ increasing proportional to the doping x [58]. A number of attempts have been made to interpret this as due to a peak in the electronic susceptibility χ_q associated with a nesting feature in the Fermi surface, calculated using the three band model, with $t_{OO} \neq 0$.

There are certain difficulties associated with such interpretations, however. In the first place, in a weak coupling calculation the intensity is orders of magnitude larger for inter-vHs scattering (which in these models is commensurate at Q) than the nesting-associated scattering when the Fermi level is shifted off of the vHs (see Fig. 8 of [59]). In a marginal Fermi liquid model, this vHs intensity enhancement can be greatly reduced by quasiparticle lifetime effects [32]. In the doped material, the model predicts an incommensurate peak in

the susceptibility, in accord with experiment; however, the peak usually remains incommensurate at half filling [60]. To correct this problem, it is necessary to assume [32] that the vHs's are very close to half filling (since the nesting feature that they produce is commensurate), and this is inconsistent with LDA band structure calculations, if a semi-rigid band filling model is assumed.

While the details of the doping dependence remain to be worked out, the present model offers an alternative possibility for explaining the incommensurate peaks: the vHs's are shifted off of the X and Y points, so that *inter-vHs scattering is incommensurate*, and the peak positions depend on the interplay of the correlation effects and tilting instability, which modify the *shape* of the Fermi surface.

Here, I can only indicate that the observed Fermi surfaces are consistent with the direction and magnitude of the distortion δ . From Fig. 17a, it can be seen that there are a large number (9) of inter-vHs scattering vectors near Q , of which two are illustrated. Figure 17b shows the relative distribution of the nine peaks about the central commensurate position. The four outermost points match the positions of the observed incommensurate neutron scattering peaks (Fig. 17c). As far as the magnitude of the effect goes, the observation that $\delta \simeq 2x$ [58] would require the vHs peak to fall a fraction x of the distance from, e.g., Y toward Γ . For $x = 0.14$, this is about twice as far as the largest Fermi surface of Fig. 8b.

While this result is suggestive, a number of problems remain. A more detailed calculation is required to determine the relative intensities of the various peaks. Moreover, it is not clear how the doping dependence of the peak arises in the present model.

E. Phase Separation

An additional complication which has been neglected in this paper is the possibility of some form of hole phase separation away from half filling, due either to magnetic effects [61], electron-phonon interaction [46], or long-range Coulomb interaction (specifically, the next-nearest-neighbor Coulomb repulsion, V) [20]. In this transition, the holes bunch up in such

a way that part of them remain pinned at the insulating phase at half filling. The entries in Table II suggest yet another form of instability, which may be called a ‘molecular JT’ effect, since it arises when Δ or $\Delta_d \rightarrow 0$, which leads to additional electronic degeneracies. There is considerable experimental evidence for such phase separation [62,41,63]. If a self-consistent theory for the LTO structural transition can be developed, it will be possible to calculate the criteria for many of these instabilities.

The physics underlying the electron-phonon induced phase separation [46] can readily be understood. The structural instability is stabilized by lowering the kinetic energy of the *occupied* electronic states, and hence the energy lowering is optimized when the Fermi level falls precisely at the (undistorted) vHs – or equivalently, half way between the two vHs of the distorted structure. In this case, the parameter regime associated with Fig. 16 is most interesting. There are *two* dopings at which the Fermi level falls at an optimal position for structural instability – both at $x \simeq 0.15$, the original vHs, and at $x = 0^-$, the diabolical point. The new point, $x = 0^-$ will be associated with the greater structural instability (higher transition temperature), since all of the dos is shifted away from the Fermi level. In contrast, for the old vHs, only part of the Fermi surface is gapped, leaving behind hole pockets. For intermediate dopings, the dos (in the distorted phase) increases, leading to a reduced kinetic energy lowering. If this reduction is large enough, the system will prefer to phase separate, keeping some holes at $x \simeq 0^-$ and the rest at $x \simeq 0.15$.

F. Future Directions

Clearly, much work remains to be done, including working through detailed calculations of the effects discussed in the earlier subsections of this chapter. It will also be important to study the temperature and doping dependence of the LTO phase transition, in the presence of correlation effects. Fitting the positions of the incommensurate neutron peaks may allow some of the parameter values to be pinned down. It would also be desirable to extend the model to $\text{YBa}_2\text{Cu}_3\text{O}_{7-\delta}$, where such incommensurate modulations have not been observed.

Acknowledgments: I would like to thank G. Kotliar for useful conversations. Publication 583 from the Barnett Institute.

Appendix I: Band Dispersion Relations

While the eigenvalue equation, Eq. 4, must be solved numerically, it is convenient to rewrite it as a polynomial in E . First, neglecting electron-phonon coupling ($\eta = 0$),

$$4E^2 A_1 + 4Ex A_2 + x^2 A_3 + 2(\Delta - E)B_1 + (\Delta - E)^2 B_2 = 0, \quad (A1)$$

where $x = 4t_{OO}$, $\bar{s}_i = \sin(k_i a)$, and

$$A_1 = \lambda_A^4 - (|\lambda_x|^2 \bar{c}_x + |\lambda_y|^2 \bar{c}_y)^2 + 2t^2(2|\lambda_x - \lambda_y|^2 - \lambda_A^2) \bar{c}_x \bar{c}_y + 2t^2(\lambda_A^2 + |\lambda_x|^2 \bar{s}_x^2 + |\lambda_y|^2 \bar{s}_y^2) + t^4(4 - (\bar{c}_x + \bar{c}_y)^2), \quad (A2)$$

$$A_2 = \lambda_B^2(|\lambda_x|^2 \bar{s}_x^2 + |\lambda_y|^2 \bar{s}_y^2) + t^2(|\lambda_x + \lambda_y|^2 + 2t^2)(\bar{s}_x^2 + \bar{s}_y^2) - t^2(|\lambda_x|^2 - |\lambda_y|^2)(\bar{c}_x^2 - \bar{c}_y^2), \quad (A3)$$

$$A_3 = \bar{s}_x^2 \bar{s}_y^2 (\lambda_B^2 + 2t^2)^2, \quad (A4)$$

$$B_1 = 2E^3(\lambda_A^2 + 2t^2) + E^2 x(\lambda_B^2 + 2t^2)(1 + \bar{c}_x \bar{c}_y) - E(x^2/2)(|\lambda_x|^2 \bar{s}_x^2 + |\lambda_y|^2 \bar{s}_y^2 + t^2[\bar{s}_x^2 + \bar{s}_y^2]) - (x^3/4)\bar{s}_x^2 \bar{s}_y^2 (\lambda_B^2 + 2t^2), \quad (A5)$$

$$B_2 = E^4 - E^2(x^2/2)(1 + \bar{c}_x \bar{c}_y) + x^4 \bar{s}_x^2 \bar{s}_y^2 / 16, \quad (A6)$$

and $\lambda_A^2 = |\lambda_x|^2 + |\lambda_y|^2$, $\lambda_B^2 = \lambda_x \lambda_y^* + \lambda_y \lambda_x^*$.

Including electron-phonon coupling, the following terms should be added to Eq. A1:

$$\eta' C_1 - \eta'^2 B_2, \quad (A7)$$

where

$$C_1 = 4E^3(t^2[\bar{c}_x + \bar{c}_y] - |\lambda_x|^2 \bar{c}_x - |\lambda_y|^2 \bar{c}_y) + 4E^2 x t^2(\bar{c}_x + \bar{c}_y) + E x^2(t^2[\bar{c}_x + \bar{c}_y][1 - \bar{c}_x \bar{c}_y] - \bar{s}_x^2 \bar{c}_y |\lambda_x|^2 - \bar{s}_y^2 \bar{c}_x |\lambda_y|^2) - (x^3/8)\lambda_B^2(\bar{c}_x + \bar{c}_y), \quad (A8)$$

and $\eta' = 2\eta(\bar{c}_x + \bar{c}_y)$ in the LTO phase, or $\eta' = 2\eta\bar{c}_x$ in the LTT phase, with $\eta_{LTT} = 2\eta_{LTO}$. It should be noted that, despite their complicated form, Eqs. A4,A7 are a quadratic equation in $\bar{c}_y(E, \bar{c}_x)$, except in the LTO phase when $\eta \neq 0$.

These equations also have an important scaling form, in the narrow band limit. That is, if t is so small that $E \gg E - \Delta$, then E may be replaced by the fixed value Δ everywhere in Eqs A4-A9, except when it occurs in the combination $E - \Delta$. In this case, scaling $t \rightarrow t' = r_0 t$, $\lambda_i \rightarrow r_0 \lambda_i$, for all i , $\eta \rightarrow r_0^2 \eta$, and $(E - \Delta) \rightarrow r_0^2 (E - \Delta)$, the system of equations is *invariant*. That is, in the scaling limit, only the bandwidth is rescaled, but the shapes of the Fermi surfaces are unchanged, and the dos keeps the same shape, but is enhanced by a factor $1/r_0^2$.

Appendix II: Effective Value of t_{OO}

IIa: Equation for t_{OO}^{eff}

Feiner, et al. [35] introduced a five band model of the CuO_2 plane, to explore the role of the apical oxygen. Here, I use the corresponding one-electron band structure to demonstrate the reduction in value of the effective O-O hopping parameter, t_{OO} . The band dispersion can be written in the form

$$A(1 - b[s_x^2 + s_y^2] - cs_x^2 s_y^2) = 0, \quad (B1a)$$

with

$$A = E^2(E - \Delta)V, \quad (B1b)$$

$$Ab = E[(E - \Delta)W + 4Et_{CuO}^2 V], \quad (B1c)$$

$$Ac = 8[t_{OO}(E - \Delta) + 2t_{CuO}^2][2t_{OO}V - W], \quad (B1d)$$

$$V = (E - \bar{\Delta}_z)(E - \delta_O) - \alpha_1^2,$$

$$W = 4[(E - \bar{\Delta}_z)\alpha_2^2 + (E - \delta_O)\alpha_3^2 - 2\alpha_1\alpha_2\alpha_3].$$

The definition of the parameters differs somewhat from Feiner, et al. [35]. The zero of energy is taken at the planar O p -levels, and t_{OO} is taken as a positive number. The new

parameters are $\bar{\Delta}_z = \Delta - \Delta_z$, the Cu d_{z^2} level, δ_O , the apical O level, $t_{CuA} = \sqrt{3}\alpha_1$, the Cu d_{z^2} – apical O hopping parameter, $t_{OA} = \alpha_2/2$, the apical O – planar O hopping parameter, and $t_z = \alpha_3$, the Cu d_{z^2} – planar O hopping parameter. Molecular orbital theory would give $t_z = t_{CuO}/\sqrt{3}$. Calculated [28] values for these parameters are listed in Table I.

From Eq. B1a, the vHs is determined as that energy for which the point (e.g.) $s_x = 1$, $s_y = 0$ is at the Fermi level, or $b = 1$. For this choice of b , the shape of the Fermi surface, $k_y(k_x)$ is given by the solution of Eq. B1a. Hence, *all models with the same value of c will have the same shape of Fermi surface at the vHs!* In particular, the vHs will fall at exactly the same doping. Thus, for a three-band model to agree with the five-band model, the parameter t_{OO} must take different values in the two models. [More generally, the three-band t_{OO} will have a different value from the LDA t_{OO} – presumably, the five-band model will be closer to the LDA value.]

In the three-band model, the band dispersion is given by Eq. B1a, with

$$c = 2y + y^2,$$

and $y = 4t_{OO}^{eff}/E_{vHs}$. Hence the vHs of the three-band model will fall at the same doping as that of the five-band model, if t_{OO}^{eff} is chosen to satisfy

$$y = y' - \frac{2W}{E'_{vHs}V}, \quad (B2)$$

where $y' = 4t_{OO}/E'_{vHs}$ in the five-band model. Note that not only is $t_{OO} \neq t_{OO}^{eff}$, but the vHs is located at a different energy. In the five-band model, the vHs is given by the largest zero of $b = 1$, or

$$(E[E - \Delta] - 4t_{CuO}^2)V - (E - \Delta)W = 0, \quad (B3)$$

while in the three-band model, the vHs is given by Eq. B3 with $W = 0$, $V = 1$. Defining $\eta_{vHs} = E_{vHs}/E'_{vHs} (\leq 1)$, then Eq. B2 can be put into a suggestive form when $\alpha_1 = 0$:

$$t_{OO}^{eff} = \eta_{vHs}(t_{OO} - \frac{2\alpha_2^2}{(E - \delta_O)} - \frac{2\alpha_3^2}{(E - \Delta_z)}). \quad (B4)$$

This is essentially the form suggested in Table II.

Note that the above reasoning implicitly assumes that the only role of t_{OO} in the theory is to move the vHs away from half filling. This is in fact my present belief. If it is found that t_{OO} plays some other role (or that, e.g., the apical oxygen plays such a role), then this would be evidence that the simple three-band model cannot capture the essential physics of the process. Until such time as that becomes necessary, however, it is simpler to work with the three-band model, with correctly chosen effective parameters.

IIb: Numerical Estimates of t_{OO}^{eff}

Given values for all the band parameters, t_{OO}^{eff} can be calculated from Eq. B2. Once more, there are separate problems in estimating the bare parameters and the renormalized parameters. Here, I will only give an illustration of the orders of magnitude expected. The new parameters will be assumed to have the values given in Table I [28], with $\Delta = 4eV$, $\bar{\Delta}_z = 3.36eV$, $t_{CuO} = 1.3eV$, and $t_{OO} = 0.65eV$. Since the effect of each of the three hopping terms is quite different, I first illustrate how t_{OO}^{eff} would change if only one of the α 's were non-zero (with value given by Table I). If only α_1 is non-zero, it has a small effect on the vHs, $t_{OO}^{eff} = 0.57eV$. Either α_2 or α_3 have comparable effects, with either leading to $t_{OO}^{eff} = 0.40eV$. For all three α 's non-zero, $t_{OO}^{eff} = 0.28eV$. Hence, the expected reductions can be quite substantial. For somewhat larger α values, t_{OO} could even change sign. Thus, for $\alpha_2 = 1$, $\alpha_3 = 0.75$ (the molecular orbital value), and $\alpha_1 = 0$, $t_{OO} = -0.1$.

Correlation effects will modify this result, particularly near half filling. In particular, both α_1 and α_3 should scale to zero as $\sim r_0$, but α_2 , which involves an O-O hopping, should not be much affected. Since Δ is itself reduced by a factor of ~ 3 , and it enters into the denominator of Eq. B2 or B4 ($E \simeq \Delta$), then t_{OO}^{eff} may not be significantly renormalized.

In principle, going from a five-band to a three-band model could also renormalize the total width of the band – i.e., lead to an effective value for t_{CuO} as well. In practice, this does not seem to occur, so only t_{OO} is renormalized.

Appendix III: Distortion of CuO₆ Octahedra

Ohta, et al. [38], by compiling data on a large number of cuprate superconductors, were able to find only one consistent correlation between T_c and a molecular property: the larger the apical oxygen – planar oxygen energy splitting, ΔV_A , the higher is T_c . In the text, I suggest a related correlation: a smaller value of the $d - d$ splitting ΔV_d should cause a smaller effective value of t_{OO} [33], which in turn correlates with a lower value of T_c .

The correlation of ΔV_d with d_a has an origin reminiscent of a ‘classical’ JT effect, and indeed Cu is a JT ion, often found in a distorted octahedral environment [36]. That is, if the six oxygens around each Cu formed a perfect octahedron, then the Cu $d_{x^2-y^2}$ and d_{z^2} levels would be exactly degenerate. The structural distortion lifts the degeneracy, as in a static JT effect. However, in the ordinary JT effect it is the splitting of the electronic degeneracy which is the driving force for the distortion. Here the problem is more complex – there are large commensurability strains between the Cu planes and the La planes, and the octahedral distortion leads to a considerable strain relief (this is why all octahedra distort along the same direction). The same sort of distorted octahedra appear in LaNiO_4 , and Ni is not a JT ion [37].

Nevertheless, the distortion does cause the d-d splitting, as can be seen from an analysis of the data base of Ohta, et al. In particular, ΔV_d is linearly proportional to d_A/d_p , the octahedral distortion (d_p is the planar Cu-O distance), Figure 18a. Most of the compounds analyzed have only a five-fold oxygen coordination about the Cu, so even when $d_A/d_p = 1$, the two d levels are not degenerate. That is why the solid line in Fig. 18a does not pass through $\Delta V_d = 0$ when $d_A = d_p$. For the 6-fold coordinated materials (circled in Fig. 18a), it is possible to draw an alternative line (dashed line) which does pass through this point.

Now, when $d_A \neq d_p$, the apical and planar O’s will have different Madelung energies, so there should be a correlation between ΔV_A and d_A/d_p . Unfortunately, this correlation is considerably weaker (Fig. 18b) than that with ΔV_d , presumably because the apical O’s see the non- CuO_2 planes, which vary considerably from one material to another.

Appendix IV: Electron Picture of Correlation Effects

Equations 11, which are valid in a hole picture, can be replaced by the following equations, in an electron picture:

$$r_0^2 = \frac{1}{2} [\sum_k u_k^2 f_e(E_k) - 1], \quad (D1a)$$

$$\Delta_0 - \Delta = \frac{1}{2r_0^2} \sum_k u_k^2 f_e(E_k) (\Delta - E_k). \quad (D1b)$$

The equivalence of the two pictures can be shown by subtracting the corresponding pairs of equations (e.g., Eq. 11a and D1a) and using the fact that $f_e(E_k) = 1 - f_h(E_k)$ (valid for all temperatures). This results in

$$\frac{1}{2} \sum_k u_k^2 = 1, \quad (D2a)$$

$$\Delta = \frac{1}{2} \sum_k u_k^2 E_k. \quad (D2b)$$

In the above equations, it is essential to keep in mind that the summation is over all k -states of *all three hybridized bands*, Eq. 12. Equations D2 have a simple interpretation, saying that the three bands contain exactly one Cu electron (and two O electrons) per unit cell (Eq. D2a), and that the average Cu energy is unchanged by hybridization (Eq. D2b). To prove Eq. D2b, the explicit form of u_k and E_k are required. For simplicity, only the simplest case, based on Eq. 1 with t_{OO} (and U) set equal to zero. In this case, the nonbonding band is purely O-like, and may be neglected. For the bonding and antibonding bands,

$$E_k = \frac{\Delta}{2} \pm \sqrt{\left(\frac{\Delta}{2}\right)^2 + 4t_{CuO}^2 \gamma_k}, \quad (D3a)$$

$\gamma_k = \sin^2(k_x a/2) + \sin^2(k_y a/2)$, and

$$u_k^2 = \frac{E_k}{2E_k - \Delta}. \quad (D3b)$$

Using Eqs. D3,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_k u_k^2 E_k &= \sum_k' \frac{E_k^2}{2E_k - \Delta} \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \sum_k' \left[E_k + \frac{\Delta}{2} \left(1 + \frac{\Delta/2}{E_k - \Delta/2} \right) \right] \\ &= \left[\Delta + \frac{\Delta}{2} (2 + 0) \right] = 2\Delta, \end{aligned}$$

thus confirming Eq. D2b. Here the prime means summation over two bands only.

In the above argument, it is essential to note that the equivalence works only if the summation is over all three bands (in the more general case $t_{OO} \neq 0$). Hence, at $T \simeq 0$ the hole picture is considerably more convenient, since the summation can in this case be restricted to the antibonding band only.

Table I: Bare Parameters (eV)

Parameter	Reference		
	[27]	[28]	[29]
Δ	3.6	3.51	3.5
t_{CuO}	1.3	1.47	1.3
t_{OO}	0.65	0.61	0.65
V	1.2	0.52	< 1
Δ_d	—	0.64	—
δ_0	—	1.46	—
α_1	—	0.47	—
α_2	—	0.66	—
α_3	—	0.50	—

Table II: Suggested Effective Parameter Values

Parameter	Bare Value (eV)	Scaling*	Corrected Bare Value (eV)
t_{CuO}	1.3	$\sim \sqrt{N'}r_0$ (Eq. 11a)	
Δ	$\Delta_0 + 2V$	(Eq. 11b)	5-6
t_{OO}	$t_{OO}^1 \simeq 0.65$	$t_{OO}^1 - X/\Delta$	0.14 (LSCO) 0.3 (YBCO)
η	0.005 (LTO) 0.08 (LTT)	$\sim N'r_0^2\theta^2/\Delta$	0.016 (LTO) 0.25 (LTT)
λ	0.006 (LTO) 0.024 (LTT)	$\sim \sqrt{N'}r_0\theta/\Delta_d$	?

*: $N' = N/2$ in the spin-corrected model.

REFERENCES

- [1] J.E. Hirsch and D.J. Scalapino, Phys. Rev. Lett. **56**, 2732 (1986); J. Labbe and J. Bok, Europhys. Lett. **3**, 1225 (1987); I. E. Dzyaloshinskii, Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz. **93**, 1487 (1987) [Sov. Phys.-JETP **66**, 848 (1987)]. For reviews, see J. Friedel, J. Phys. Cond. Matt. **1**, 7757 (1989); R.S. Markiewicz, Int. J. Mod. Phys. B**5**, 2037 (1991); and D.M. Newns, C.C. Tsuei, P.C. Pattnaik, and C.L. Kane, Comments in Cond. Matt. Phys. **15**, 273 (1992).
- [2] D.S. Dessau, Z.-X. Shen, D.M. King, D. Marshall, J. DiCarlo, C.-H. Park, A.G. Loeser, W.E. Spicer, L.W. Lombardo, and A. Kapitulnik, Bull. APS **38**, 274 (1993); D.S. Dessau, Z.-X. Shen, D.M. King, D.S. Marshall, L.W. Lombardo, P.H. Dickinson, A.G. Loeser, J. DiCarlo, C.-H. Park, A. Kapitulnik, and W.E. Spicer, Phys. Rev. Lett. **71**, 2781 (1993); D. Dessau, Ph.D. Thesis, Stanford U., 1993.
- [3] A.A. Abrikosov, J.C. Campuzano, K. Gofron, Physica C**214**, 73 (1993); K. Gofron, J.C. Campuzano, R. Liu, H. Ding, B. Dabrowski, and B.W. Veal, Bull. APS **38**, 273 (1993); K. Gofron, J.C. Campuzano, R. Liu, H. Ding, D. Koelling, A.A. Abrikosov, B. Dabrowski, and B.W. Veal, unpublished; K. Gofron, personal communication.
- [4] R.S. Markiewicz, Physica C**193**, 323 (1992).
- [5] R.S. Markiewicz, Physica C**200**, 65 (1992), **207**, 281 (1993), and **210**, 264 (1993).
- [6] R.S. Markiewicz, Physica C**210**, 235 (1993).
- [7] D. Coffey, T.M. Rice, and F.C. Zhang, Phys. Rev. B**44**, 10112 (1991).
- [8] N.E. Bonesteel, T.M. Rice, and F.C. Zhang, Phys. Rev. Lett. **68**, 2684 (1992).
- [9] R.S. Markiewicz, J. Phys. Condens. Matt. **2**, 6223 (1990); S. Barisic and J. Zelenko, Sol. St. Commun. **74**, 367 (1990); W.E. Pickett, R.E. Cohen, and H. Krakauer, Phys. Rev. Lett. **67**, 228 (1991).

- [10] J.P. Pouget, C. Noguera, and R. Moret, J. Phys. (France) **49**, 375, 1988.
- [11] S. Barišić and I. Batistić, J. Physique **49**, 153 (1988).
- [12] J. Song and J.F. Annett, unpublished.
- [13] E. Teller, J. Phys. Chem. **41**, 109 (1937).
- [14] G. Herzberg and H.C. Longuet-Higgins, Discuss. Faraday Soc., **35**, 77 (1963).
- [15] C.A. Mead and D.G. Truhlar, J. Chem. Phys. **70**, 2284 (1979).
- [16] M.V. Berry and M. Wilkinson, Proc. Roy. Soc. Lond. **A392**, 15 (1984).
- [17] H.C. Longuet-Higgins, Proc. Roy. Soc. Lond. **A344**, 147 (1975).
- [18] M.V. Berry, Proc. Roy. Soc. Lond. **A392**, 45 (1984).
- [19] H.J. Schulz, Phys. Rev. **B39**, 2940 (1989), and A.A. Nersesyan, G.I. Japaridze, and I.G. Kimeridze, J. Phys. Cond. Matt. **3**, 3353 (1991).
- [20] R. Raimondi, C. Castellani, M. Grilli, Y. Bang, and G. Kotliar, Phys. Rev. **B47**, 3331 (1993).
- [21] G. Kotliar, P.A. Lee, and N. Read, Physica **C153-155**, 538 (1988).
- [22] A. Sudbø and A. Houghton, J. Phys. Cond. Matt. **2**, 5971 (1990).
- [23] D.M. Newns, P.C. Pattnaik, and C.C. Tsuei, Phys. Rev. **B43**, 3075 (1991).
- [24] Q. Si and K. Levin, Phys. Rev. **B44**, 4727 (1991).
- [25] C. Castellani, G. Kotliar, R. Raimondi, M. Grilli, Z. Wang, and M. Rozenberg, Phys. Rev. Lett. **69**, 2009 (1992).
- [26] M. Grilli, G. Kotliar, and A.J. Millis, Phys. Rev. **B42**, 329 (1990).
- [27] M.S. Hybertsen, E.B. Stechel, M. Schluter, and D.R. Jennison, Phys. Rev. **B41**, 11068 (1990).

- [28] J.B. Grant and A.K. McMahan, Phys. Rev. B**46**, 8440 (1992).
- [29] H. Eskes, G.A. Sawadsky, and L.F. Feiner, Physica C**160**, 424 (1989).
- [30] A.K. McMahan, J.F. Annett, and R.M. Martin, Phys. Rev. B**42**, 6268 (1990).
- [31] C.A. Balseiro, M. Avignon, A.G. Rojo, and B. Alascio, Phys. Rev. Lett. **62**, 2624 (1989).
- [32] P.B. Littlewood, J. Zaanen, G. Aeppli, and H. Monien, Phys. Rev. B**48**, 487 (1993).
- [33] A.A. Aligia, Phys. Rev. B**39**, 6700 (1989).
- [34] J.H. Jefferson, H. Eskes, and L.F. Feiner, Phys. Rev. B**45**, 7959 (1992).
- [35] L.F. Feiner, M. Grilli, and C. di Castro, Phys. Rev. B**45**, 10647 (1992).
- [36] J.K. Burdett, “Molecular Shapes” (Wiley, NY, 1980), p. 181; I. Bersuker and V.Z. Polinger, “Vibronic Interactions in Molecules and Crystals” (Springer, Berlin, 1989).
- [37] W.E. Pickett, Rev. Mod. Phys. **61**, 433 (1989).
- [38] Y. Ohta, T. Tohyama, and S. Maekawa, Phys. Rev. B**43**, 2968 (1991).
- [39] T. Thio, T.R. Thurston, N.W. Preyer, P.J. Picone, M.A. Kastner, H.P. Jenssen, D.R. Gabbe, C.Y. Chen, R.J. Birgeneau, and A. Aharony, Phys. Rev. B**38**, 905 (1988).
- [40] F.S. Ham, in “Electron Paramagnetic Resonance”, ed. by S. Geschwind (Plenum, NY, 1972), p. 1.
- [41] R.S. Markiewicz, Physica C**217**, 381 (1993).
- [42] J.H. Kim, K. Levin, R. Wentzcovitch, and A. Auerbach, Phys. Rev. B**44**, 5148 (1991);
J.H. Kim and Z. Tešanović, Phys. Rev. Lett. **71**, 4218 (1994).
- [43] P.W. Anderson, Phys. Scripta **T42**, 11 (1992).
- [44] G.M. Eliashberg, Physica A**200**, 95 (1993).
- [45] E. Lieb and F. Wu, Phys. Rev. Lett. **20**, 1445 (1968).

- [46] R.S. Markiewicz, J. Phys. Cond. Matt. **2**, 665 (1990).
- [47] G. Dopf, A. Muramatsu, and W. Hanke, Phys. Rev. **B41**, 9264 (1990).
- [48] R.T. Scalettar, D.J. Scalapino, R.L. Sugar, and S.R. White, Phys. Rev. **B44**, 770 (1991).
- [49] P. Monthoux and D. Pines, Phys. Rev. **B47**, 6069 (1993).
- [50] C.A.R. Sa de Mello and S. Doniach, Phys. Rev. **B41**, 6633 (1990).
- [51] M.S. Hybertsen, E.B. Stechel, W.M.C. Foulkes, and M. Schlüter, Phys. Rev. **B45**, 10032 (1992); V.I. Belinicher and A.L. Chernyshev, Physica **C213**, 293 (1993).
- [52] L. Zhang, J.K. Jain, and V.J. Emery, Phys. Rev. **B46**, 5599 (1992).
- [53] T.C. Leung, X.W. Wang, and B.N. Harmon, Phys. Rev. **B37**, 384 (1988).
- [54] J.R. Schrieffer, X.-G. Wen, and S.C. Zhang, Phys. Rev. Lett. **60**, 944 (1988).
- [55] N. Read and S. Sachdev, Phys. Rev. **B42**, 4568 (1990); A.V. Chubukov, S. Sachdev, and J. Ye, unpublished.
- [56] R.S. Markiewicz, Physica **C177**, 445 (1991).
- [57] R.S. Markiewicz, Physica **C168**, 195 (1990).
- [58] S.-W. Cheong, G. Aeppli, T.E. Mason, H. Mook, S.M. Hayden, P.C. Canfield, Z. Fisk, K.N. Klausen, and J.L. Martinez, Phys. Rev. Lett. **67**, 1791 (1991).
- [59] P. Bénard, L. Chen, and A.-M.S. Tremblay, Phys. Rev. **B47**, 15217 (1993).
- [60] R.S. Markiewicz, Physica **C170**, 29 (1990).
- [61] V.J. Emery, S.A. Kivelson, and H.Q. Lin, Phys. Rev. Lett. **64**, 475 (1990).
- [62] V.J. Emery and S.A. Kivelson, Physica **C209**, 597 (1993).
- [63] J.A. Hodges, P. Bonville, P. Imbert, G. Jéhanno, and P. Debray, Physica **C184**, 270 (1991); R.K. Kremer, E. Sigmund, V. Hizhnyakov, F. Hentsch, A. Simon, K.A. Müller,

and M. Mehring, Z. Phys. B**86**, 319 (1992).

Figure Captions

Fig. 1 Energy dispersions of the LTO phase of the 2D CuO₂ sheets, for various choices of band parameters. [Dot-dashed lines = dispersion along the line $X \rightarrow \bar{M}$.] Parameters are $t = 1.3eV$, $\Delta = 4eV$, $t_{OO} = 0.65eV$ in all cases, with $\lambda_2, \lambda_1, \eta =$ (a) 0, 0, 0; (b) 6meV, 0, 0; (c) solid lines = 50meV, 0, 0; dashed lines = 50meV, 0, 100meV; (d) 50meV, 50meV, 0.

Fig. 2 Fermi surfaces of the LTO phase of the 2D CuO₂ sheets, assuming the same parameters as Fig. 1a,b, respectively. The Fermi energies are (following the solid surfaces of Fig. 2a, from lower left to upper right) $E_F = 4.5, 5.0, 5.28$, and $5.5eV$.

Fig. 3 Comparing the Fermi surfaces of the LTT (solid and dashed lines) and the LTO phases (dotted lines) [dashed lines = dispersion near Y ; solid lines = near X]. (a) = same parameters as Fig. 1c (solid lines); (b) = same parameters as Fig. 1c (dashed lines).

Fig. 4 Energy dispersion in the LTO phase, for several values of t_{OO} . Parameters are the same as the solid lines in Fig. 1c, except $t_{OO} =$ (a) 0, (b) 0.1, (c) 0.25, and (d) 0.65eV [N.B.: Fig. 4d is identical to Fig. 1c, solid lines].

Fig. 5 Density of states (plotted against electron density) for the same four t_{OO} values as in Fig. 4.

Fig. 6 Fermi surfaces associated with changes of topology (vHs or diabolical point), for the same parameters as Figs. 4,5. (a) $E_F = 5.225$ or $5.337eV$ (solid line – the hole-like and electron-like Fermi surfaces have identical shape), $E_{dia} = 5.282eV$; (b) 5.226 (dotted line), 5.338 (dashed), and 5.34eV (solid), $E_{dia} = 5.322eV$; (c) 5.227 (dotted), 5.337 (dashed), 5.386 (dot-dashed), and 5.393eV (solid); (d) 5.230 (dotted), 5.337 (dashed), 5.581 (dot-dashed), and 5.583eV (solid). The dot-dashed lines are the diabolical points.

Fig. 7 Carrier density n (electrons per Cu) for the same parameters as in Figs. 4-6: from left to right, $t_{OO} = 0, 0.1, 0.25$, and $0.65eV$.

Fig. 8 Evolution of Fermi surfaces near primary hole vHs. (a) Parameters of Fig. 6d ($t_{OO} = 0.65\text{eV}$), for several energy values, $E_F = 5.21$ (dotted line), 5.228 (dot-dash), 5.23 (solid), and 5.25eV (dashed). (b) vHs for the four cases of Fig. 6: $t_{OO} = 0$ (solid line), 0.1 (dashed), 0.25 (dot-dashed), and 0.65eV (dotted).

Fig. 9 Fermi surfaces associated with changes of topology in the LTT phase, for the same parameters as Fig. 3b. Energies are $E_F = 4.96$ (dashed lines), 5.35 (dotted), 5.47 (solid), and 5.58eV (dot-dashed).

Fig. 10 Doping x_{vHs} at which the Fermi level coincides with the vHs, vs t_{OO} , assuming $t_{CuO} = 1.3\text{eV}$. Bare parameters = solid ($\Delta = 4\text{eV}$) and dashed ($\Delta = 6\text{eV}$) lines; renormalized parameters = open ($\Delta_0 = 4\sqrt{2}\text{eV}$) and filled ($\Delta_0 = 6\sqrt{2}\text{eV}$) squares; alternatively normalized parameters (t_{OO}^t) = open ($\Delta_0^t = 4\text{eV}$) and filled ($\Delta_0^t = 6\text{eV}$) circles. Dashed lines = guides to the eye. Solid horizontal lines = expected values of x_{vHs} for LSCO and YBCO.

Fig. 11 Threshold of metal-insulator transition. Open circles = full slave boson calculation; lines = scaling regime. Parameters $(\lambda_2, \eta_0) = (0,0)$ (solid line and open circles); $(0.005\text{eV}, 0)$ (dashed line); $(0.05\text{eV}, 0)$ (dot-dashed line); $(0.05\text{eV}, 0.1\text{eV})$ (dotted line).

Fig. 12 Semimetal (SM) zero-gap semiconductor (ZGS) crossover, in scaling regime, assuming $\lambda_1 = 0$ (solid line) or $\lambda_1 = \lambda_2$ (dashed line). In the scaling regime, $y = 8t_{OO}/\Delta_0$.

Fig. 13 Slave boson calculation of metal-insulator transition, assuming $\Delta_0^t = 4$ (solid line), 5 (dashed line) or 6eV (dot-dashed line): (a) t_R ; (b) E_F ; (c) x_{vHs} (for the lines) or x_{dia} (for the symbols); (d) $\Delta E = E_F - E_{vHs}$ (lines) or $E_F - E_{dia}$ (symbols). The dotted line in Fig. 13a is the scaling regime approximation. The vHs is at the Fermi level when the corresponding line crosses the dotted line in Fig. 13c.

Fig. 14 Fermi surfaces corresponding to $\Delta_0^t = 6\text{eV}$ in Fig. 13 (dot-dashed lines), for $x = x_{vHs}$ (dashed line), 0^+ (solid line), or 0^- (dot-dashed line).

Fig. 15 Renormalized band structure and Fermi surfaces corresponding to $\Delta_0^t = 6\text{eV}$, $t_{OO}^t = 0.25\text{eV}$, $\lambda_2^t = 0.05\text{eV}$, for various dopings $x = 0.3$ (a), 0.15 (b), or 0.05 (c). Horizontal

line = Fermi level. Fig. 15d = corresponding Fermi surfaces: $x = 0.3$ (dashed line), 0.15 (dot-dashed), 0.05 (solid).

Fig. 16 Renormalized band structure and Fermi surfaces corresponding to $\Delta_0^t = 6eV$, $t_{OO}^t = 0.1eV$, $\lambda_2^t = 0.05eV$, for various dopings $x = 0.25$ (a), 0.15 (b), 0.05 (c), 0.02 (d), r -0.05 (e). Solid horizontal line = Fermi level; dashed line in Fig. 16e = diabolical point. Fig. 16f = corresponding Fermi surfaces: $x = 0.25$ (dashed line), 0.15 (dot-dashed), 0.05 (solid), -0.05 (dotted).

Fig. 17 (a) Schematic of full Brillouin zone, corresponding to Fig. 8b, illustrating some possible incommensurate, inter-vHs scattering vectors. (b) Corresponding distribution of all possible scattering vectors around central commensurate peak $Q = (\pi/a, \pi/a)$. (c) Observed incommensurate diffraction pattern in LSCO [58]; + indicates position of Q .

Fig. 18 Energy level splittings, either Cu $d_{z^2} - d_{x^2-y^2}$ (a) or apical vs. planar O (b), plotted against normalized Cu-apical O distance, d_A/d_p . Letters refer to different superconducting compounds, after Ohta, et al. [38]. Circled letters are compounds with 6-fold (distorted octahedral) coordination of the Cu.